U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION BILLFISH AND HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY

PANELS

+ + + + +

JOINT MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2005

+ + + + +

The meeting came to order at 8:00 a.m. at the Holiday Inn, Silver Spring, Maryland.

ADVISORY PANEL ROSTER:

NELSON BEIDEMAN Blue Water Fisherman's

Association

WILLIAM GERENCER Marine Trade Center

DEWEY HEMILRIGHT F/V Tar Baby

RUSSELL HUDSON Directed Shark Fisheries,

Inc.

GAIL JOHNSON Pocahontas, Inc.

DON NEHLS Lindgren-Pittman, Inc.

PETE MANUEL

RICHARD RUAIS East Coast Tuna Association

PETER WEISS General Category Tuna

Association

JAMES DONOFRIO Recreational Fishing Alliance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

MICHAEL LEECH International Game Fishing

Association

JOE McBRIDE Montauk Boatmen & Captains

Association

RUSSELL NELSON Nelson Resources Consulting

MARK SAMPSON Ocean City Charter Boat

Captain's Association

RICHARD B. STONE

WILLIAM UTLEY Coastal Conservation

Association

ROM WHITAKER Hatteras Harbor Charter Boats

SHANA MILLER

RAMON BONFIL Wildlife Conservation Society

SONJA FORDHAM The Ocean Conservancy

MERRY CAMHI Ph.D. Independent Consultant

DR. PHIL GOODYEAR

DR. ROBERT HUETER Center for Shark Research

DR. JOHN GRAVES Virginia Institute of Marine

Science

JULIE MORRIS Gulf of Mexico Fishery

Management Council

BOBBI WALKER Gulf of Mexico Fishery

Management Council

FRANK BLOUNT New England Fishery

Management Council

DR. LOUIS DANIELS South Atlantic Fishery

Management Council

RICKS E. SAVAGE Mid-Atlantic Fishery

Management Council

ROBERT PRIDE eBusiness Solutions, Inc.

EUGENIO PINELRO-SOLER Caribbean Fishery Management

Council

LARRY SIMPSON Gulf States Marine Fisheries

Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

JOHN V. O'SHEA Atlantic State Marine

Fisheries Commission

RANDY BLANKENSHIP Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department

NC Division of Marine PRESTON P. PATE

Fisheries

DAVID M. CUPKA SC Department of Natural

Resources

GLENN ULRICH SC Department of Natural

Resources

HENRY ANSLEY Georgia Coastal Resources

Division

Maryland Department of Natural Resources HOWARD KING

JACK DEVNEW Blue Water Fisherman's

Association

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE NC Fisheries Association

PAMELA BASCO GFMC Advisory Panel

ROBERT F. ZALES, II

DR. JOHN M. DEAN South Atlantic Management

Council

KIM AMENDOLA Florida Fish and Wildlife

Conservation Commission

CONTENTS		4
Workshops Discussion		5
Essential Fish Habitat • Five-year	ar review and update	44
Comments on Rulemaking		89
Break for Lunch		174
Rebuilding and Preventi Finetoo Billfish	th Sharks	198 231
Bluefin Tuna Recreational Management and Monitoring		314
Adjourn		351

NEAL R. GROSS

3

5

7

9

10

12

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

MS. STIRRATT: -- impacts and maintaining our compliance within the BiOp. For the HMS and protected resources identification workshops, the primary purpose of that would be to improve identification of the targeted species, mainly HMS, by-catch, and protected resources by fishermen, dealers, and law-enforcement agents. The alternatives which have outlined include we а no-action alternative, which would basically be to distribute the ID Guides which you all are, I hope, familiar with the hard copy documents, which were submitted last year. I believe every AP member should have a copy of that as well as other material including the placards and videos. Voluntary workshops were also proposed; those could be held at a scientific facility as well as voluntary workshops at one and/or several locations in the regions. These would be selected based upon an area that would be effective for the actual fishery participants as well as dealers and law-enforcement agents to attend.

We have also proposed voluntary interactive web-based tutorials. As we discussed during our last AP meeting, we're investigating various software packages which might allow us to put something up on the web and then have fishery participants, dealers,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and enforcement agents be able to access that via the web, and that might help reduce some of the costs associated with travel. And finally, looking at mandatory workshops in each region: Some of the pros and cons which we outlined with this particular workshop category would be that we would have increased hopeful reporting, better quota monitoring, stock assessments would be improved; there might be some economic impacts as I've already mentioned, related to travel to and from these types of meetings, but we would probably have a higher compliance rate with the regulations if folks had better understanding of those.

The protected resources and by-catch in commercial HMS fisheries workshop, the primary purpose of this workshop would be to relay information and demonstrate techniques for protected resource release, disentanglement, and resuscitation, in the commercial fisheries as well as charter head-boat fisheries. The alternatives that we have outlined include a no-action alternative, which would basically be again to distribute the educational materials as well as we have offered two voluntary-type workshops; one would be for the shark gillnet fishermen, and the other would be voluntary for all commercial longline and

Deleted: record

Deleted: of

Deleted: By

Deleted: L

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

shark gillnet fishermen.

additionally we've also offered And voluntary workshops for all of the above which would include the shark gillnet, commercial longline, as well as charter head-boat fishermen and/or captains, and mandatory workshops for all of the above fishermen, and voluntary workshops for charter headboat operations as well. Some of the pros and cons which are associated with this particular type of workshop include ecological benefits in reducing mortality. There are some economic impacts, obviously if there were mandatory workshops for folks to attend, as well as BiOp compliance; we need to meet these requirements in our recent BiOps.

And the last type of workshop which we're proposing would be compliance with an understanding of HMS regulations. The primary purpose of this type of workshop would be to provide clear explanation of our regulations, permits, legislation, protected resources, consultations, et cetera. The alternatives which we've outlined include a no-action alternative, which would again be to distribute information pertaining to our regulations. As most of you know we have a number of brochures which were on the back table; those all specify our existing regulations,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: L

something along those lines would meet this need. The other alternatives include voluntary workshops for commercial, recreational, and nongovernmental organizations, voluntary interactive web-based tutorials, and then finally a mandatory web-based option which could be linked to a certificate that participants in this particular type of workshop would get as a result of their participation in it.

Finally, the pros and cons associated with this type of workshop include improved communication, better understanding of our regulations, increased compliance, and again, if there is any type of travel to and from these types of meetings, there would probably be an economic impact associated with that. Chris, I believe that completes the presentation; so we'd be happy to obtain any of the AP's comments on these workshops as outlined in the pre-draft.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you Heather. Again, some of these workshops are mandatory as required by the biological opinions, particularly with respect to protected species' handling and release. Other aspects could be voluntary in an effort to improve our outreach and communication. I know there was some discussion yesterday about using the website and part of the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

permit renewal process to ask questions and get answers regarding effort and potentially catch things like that. Also it could be used as a vehicle to spread the message, so to speak, answer a short quiz about the HMS regulations as part of the permit renewal process, not necessarily making it a pass-fail situation but at least an educational experience. So there is a lot of aspects of workshops here, some mandatory and some potentially voluntary, and I'm certainly interested in hearing the views of the panel as to the approaches.

With respect to the mandatory, I think the key issues that Heather outlined are exactly, who needs to be certified: is it an owner, a captain, or the crew, is it a threshold of individuals onboard the vessel that would require, is it one individual, those kinds of questions are very important as we move forward. So with that we'll open up the discussion. And why don't we start in this section, since I tended to look over there yesterday with some of the newcomers, and we'll go around this way. Nelson Beideman?

MR. BEIDEMAN: Workshops: big, big issue, but the first thing is appreciation to NOAA and NMFS for the workshops that have taken place. Ever since

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we started the NED, workshops started. Each year we have workshops for the NED researchers, and then once the biological opinion came out, we have workshops for the entire fishery up and down the coast. But these have basically been initial workshops, and now we're moving into a certification level workshop. And we realize that National Marine Fisheries Service cannot move forward with the mandatory workshops that we feel are necessary for commercial fishery and certification until the Amendment 2 process is finalized. But the BiOp says that our captains have to be certified in 2005. So what the industry is doing is having an industry-certification level workshop on April the 8th in Orlando.

Now some of the participants in the fishery have already been to one or two or even more initial workshops, and those initial workshops matured as they went on. It's primarily been the fisheries research institute, ARC (Aquatic Release Conservation) working with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and Pascagoula Lab Gear folks that have put together the workshops and the training. We will be asking that those that pass evaluations on April the 8th in Orlando be given some recognition in the government certification that's to be forthcoming from this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Amendment 2 process. Also you are going to need to set up a web based for an ongoing certification as new captains come into the fishery, et cetera, and maybe those that have already passed an evaluation to be streamlined into that final certification evaluation.

This fishery is different than all the other fisheries at the table. Our small boats go out for like three to five days; our big boats go out for as many as thirty-forty days at sea. And when they come in, they're turning back around in three to five days, for some turnarounds five to seven days for a long turnaround.

We're not on land that much and we just don't fit into the convenient groups that most of the HMS fisheries can schedule. We think that workshops should be held for the most critical of issues because basically we have to lose fishing time, we have to perhaps lose a full-month's fishing trip, depending on the moon cycle, to attend any scheduled meetings.

So, we would keep workshops, for at least this fishery, to absolute critical issues -- which the Sea Turtle has been -- and we include quite a bit on protective resources into these trainings. In fact the careful handling and release tools we're

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

encouraging not just for Sea Turtles or protected resources but for all by-catch species that are going to be released, and to practice on sharks, small Swordfish, et cetera, so that when you do get the rare Sea Turtle or marine mammal, that you're prepared to handle it the most efficiently.

On the ID issue, I believe that as far as this fishery goes, that is primarily a dealer level issue, it's not a fishing vessel level issue, and it should be targeted at where the problems lie. I think other fisheries have more ID problems than what we have, but this particular fishery, our problem seemed to be at the dealer level, and perhaps it should be mandatory for them. I think something that would be very helpful is to have the new HMS ID required onboard and also required -- available to permanent fish dealers; I think that would help.

And again, I think it's very important that we move as quickly as possible into the convenience of an internet based for ongoing, and that there'll be some streamlined process or recognition of those that have already gone through the industry certification at Orlando. And we've held like a dozen initial, but this maybe the only industry level certification during 2005 in order to meet the BiOp requirements.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Nelson. Since I saw so many hands, I'll just go around the table in this direction for this session; Gail?

MS. JOHNSON: Thanks, Chris, actually all of what Nelson said, I agree with, but to expand a little bit more, I think that the Sea Turtle needs to be mandatory for certification, and I would also like to see the owners as well as the captains. I would not like to see crews; in our case, none of them can come to the United States. And I think that's so on some other vessels too, high-seas vessels. The owners, because even though captains don't change very often, they do at some times, and the owner needs to know what has to happen and convey it to the captain.

In terms of economic impacts with mandatory workshops, what will happen is because it's one workshop this year, and we have to go, that means that a trip is going to be cut short or may be delayed, and I don't know how -- when you're fishing out of the U.S. that's okay, but there are -- like our boat is not in the United States right now, we've got to leave our boat in a strange place with a crew that we hope is going to take good care of it. So that's a significant impact; I mean it could be. For the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

protected resources and by-catch in commercial HMS fisheries, most -- because we sell everything that it's legal to sell, we're quite aware of what the species ID's are. And anybody who makes their living from the ocean has got a pretty good idea of the species. Can't say about sharks, but for the species that we catch at least. I'm curious why some of these don't have more charter head-boat, and other people who catch these species, surely the commercial hook-and-line isn't the only hook that catches them, and I wonder how other people, other fisheries deal with the occasional turtle or the protected species catch.

So at some point everybody who fishes needs to understand how to deal with these and that's where I imagine the web-based thing will come in. Also you need to be able to deal with the change in captain on commercial boats and eventually on charter boats. Having the owner explain is one thing, but you need to be able to have some sort of program where a captain can go and get certified.

SPEAKER: And then train the crew?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, and train the crew. Our crew, they're not from the United States but they know exactly what to d; they're on it, if there is a turtle

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

aboard, they know exactly what to do. The HMS regulations -- this guide that was on the web and is out there -- I think that's about as good as you can do because -- I mean there's lawyers fighting over what the regulations say and what they mean. So to expect my husband or me to know exactly what they say, what they mean, and how they all work together, is going a little too far. This is good, and we'll let the lawyers fight about any little other things that go on at sea. I guess that's it for now, thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. Going down in this direction, I saw Rom, anybody before Rom -- Rom Whitaker? Oh, Henry -- Henry Ansley.

MR. ANSLEY: Mine is just real short. I just wondered, in the educational materials that have been used, I know that probably this is no idea, but what about DVDs; putting things on DVDs and sending them out, like the ID guide and maybe even these release techniques. I know a lot of boats have DVD players on them, and that might be a good way, even under (?) education sometimes, you have a DVD, you go through it, and then you go in to take the test, and that's just usually one night. So maybe a DVD would be a way to go on some of these things?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

SPEAKER: Henry just to respond to that: with the most recent turtle action, we did go through the process of putting the safe handling and release guidelines, all of that was put on to VHS and was distributed to a number of -- well, everybody in the pelagic Longline industry. And I would also add that for that particular fishery, we also ensured that they were distributed in a variety of languages, not just English but also in Spanish and Vietnamese. So we do have the capability of doing that and so we are looking into that as an option as well.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I believe those videos are actually posted on the Southeast Fisheries Science in a website too. I know that it takes a while to download them, but if you have a high-speed internet access, it is a pretty convenient way to get to view some of those streaming videos of Sea Turtle handling and release. Rom Whitaker?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, and I'm speaking in terms of I've fished in the Hatteras area for the last 20 years, probably a 150 days a year. And out of those 20 years, I've had one Sea Turtle encounter and one dolphin encounter. And the dolphin; just snagged it pulling through a school of white-sided dolphins. So I think it would be -- I really feel like it would

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

be a waste of NMFS money to make it mandatory for our industry to attend a workshop when it is such a rare event of a Sea Turtle or a dolphin. I certainly think that most of our guys have seen some of the literature that have been sent on unhooking and reviving the Sea Turtles, and I think it would be just -- I mean I feel like that money could be spent much better elsewhere. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Rom. Bob Pride?

MR. PRIDE: Well, I'd like to echo Rom's comments about the very rare occurrence of interaction with protected species in recreational HMS fisheries. I've been fishing offshore for about 25 years and I've never encountered a Sea Turtle in terms of getting on the end of my hook, and I've hit one seabird with my boat running at night, and that's it, no mammals whatsoever.

Second comment, on certification: I'm involved in the computer industry and one of the problems is always when you have web-based tutorials and certification, is identifying who the student is.

And what we've done in the computer industry is that the classroom can be on the web, but the actual certification test is always in person so you can

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

present an ID. And that's something you're going to have to think about as to -- if you really want this certification process to work, you're going to have to identify your student that gets your certificate.

And I'm kind of with Gail: I think maybe that if you certify the captains and allow them to train their crew, that might be the best way to go, because of all the issues and logistics with getting crew members into a classroom. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Bob. Next, Bob Zales?

MR. ZALES: Well, I'm going to speak kind of like Rom did. In the Gulf of Mexico in 38 years of fishing, I've caught one turtle. And on the recreational and the for-hire side of this thing -- and we just went to this, the Gulf Council meeting a couple of weeks ago; they are looking at the same thing in the reef fish fishery. The interactions for the recreational and the for-hire industry are so small; it just doesn't seem to be a wise use of the resources to try to expend the time, money, and effort to do this.

Besides that there is a significant difference on the gear that we use. The tackle that I'm using, even when I'm fishing HMS, is generally no

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

more than a hundred-pound tackle. And when you're looking at hooking up with a three or four hundred pound turtle, the odds are, if you get him above the water, unless you back down on that animal, you're not going to get him to the boat, you're going to break that line off. So it's going to be real difficult to do.

And like in reef fish, I'm using 60 and 80 pound tackle. And the one turtle that I caught, which was I guess probably ten years ago, we spend an hour, we did not know it was a turtle because that was in a hundred and fifty feet of water reef fishing for grouper, and we thought we had one hell of a fish on there, but when we got him within about 10 to 15 feet of the surface, we saw what it was, he came up we backed down, we cut the line off, and he swam on off. So you know, it's just -- we think that you can use your money much more wisely in some other kind of educational effort.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Bob Hueter?

MR. HUETER: Thank you, Chris. First, a shameless plug: if you decide to go forward with these workshops, we at Mote Marine Laboratory would be happy to participate. We have the expertise and facilities;

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we could work with Russ Dunn in the southeast region to help set these up. So, if it is decided to go forward, especially in the species identification -- I do emphasize that species identification of sharks is still a very major problem. And not only the fishermen and the captains but the port samplers could use some education.

I would just, as sort of an educator I would question the effectiveness of voluntary workshops. Like voluntary classes in college, I mean who's going to come. So it would be nice if there were some kind of positive incentive system that could be used; I don't know if such a thing exists or not. But I would certainly question why we would have a voluntary workshop for the shark gillnet fishery when you have five boats involved in that fishery. I mean five crews, five captains, or less. So at least in that limited case, it seems like that should be mandatory. But other than that I would search for some more positive incentives to get these folks to come to these workshops. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Bob. With regard to your offer of assistance, would that be for in-person training situations, or with production of DVDs and video-type things, or all of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the above, web-based?

MR. HUETER: Well, I would say all of the above. We would certainly be happy to host workshops onsite, and we do that sort of thing all the time.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes, okay.

MR. HUETER: But, I would say that we would be interested in all those things. And with the folks that we have, and having Jose Castro, for example, at our facility, I mean that is the kind of thing that we could do, especially obviously for the sharks, but we'd be happy to work on all HMS. And as I said, I would be -- I think I talked to Russ just briefly. I think Russ would be keen to help facilitate that as well. So at least for the southeast region I'm just making that offer.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. Sonja Fordham?

MS. FORDHAM: Thank you. Sonja Fordham, the Ocean Conservancy. I want to echo what Bob just said and tell you that we'll also make comments in writing after I get a chance to talk to our mammal and turtle staff. But I wanted to take this opportunity -- I'm sorry I missed the presentation; I swear my last mobile broke down. But I'm assuming that these workshops would also could or will cover Smalltooth

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Sawfish. And I just wanted to draw attention to that species because around the table people keep talking about turtles and mammals, and remind people that Sawfish had been listed under the ESA, and that we're working on a recovery plan that we hope would be on draft form later this year.

And clearly getting the word out about these species and preventing their by-catch and by-catch mortality is really crucial to, literally, survival of the species and that the scientists estimate that there are just a few thousand Sawfish left. everyone really counts in this case. So we think workshops are really important; they may come under the recovery plan, but I think that you have an opportunity to get a jump on that process and help the population in the mean time, and also perhaps avoid the need to duplicate efforts. If we get a jump on that -- that would be particularly the bottom Longline and gillnet fisheries, but also recreational fisheries are catching Sawfish. So I just want to draw attention to that and thank you for trying; it looks like your are really incorporating Sawfish into this pre-draft, so we appreciate that. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Sonja. Joe McBride?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Chris. A number of things: some statements first of all, and then to go along with most of the other charter party boat people at the hearing here. In 30 years I've never tagged or encountered a turtle other than to see them as I go back and forth, and I've seen probably thousands of them going back and forth in the grounds on a daily basis. And as Rom said earlier, I probably fish a hundred and fifty days, both inshore and offshore. A good 50 percent of my fishing is offshore for Tuna, sharks, et cetera. The first initial problem last year I think was mostly turtle by-catch, that was the big concern. Obviously we've expanded it to get into other mammals in a greater degree than the original last year's workshops, and those were mostly turtle by-catch and methodology to avoid turtle by-catch with certain types of bait and circle hooks. recollection correct, close enough from last year's meeting?

Okay, that's right. Now we've obviously expanded this, and that's a good thing, but if you are going to get into other than the turtles, which seems to be a problem more for the pelagic Longline fleet than it is for the inshore fleet, just because in the nature of, like you say the time out there in the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

areas that you fish in, that probably attract them for the same reason they attract your targeted goals. So my question first for the pelagic Longline fleet: if we have -- and I remember the story -- two percent to five percent of the pelagic Longline fleets, do we really think, let's say for example, a Spanish Longliner is going to release a turtle that he can sell back in Spain. I mean as a lay person not being involved in that industry, and as just not being a biologist and what have you, somehow I suspect that some of these foreign fleets are going to conform to our regulations regarding the adjudication of court cases, whatever initiated the problems we're trying to address right now.

Now, going into other mammals and other species and sharks as Sonja and Bob just mentioned, very important. And someone said, I think facetiously but I think accurately, that the first persons that you want to increase their ability to identify different species including sharks, would be your own dock surveyors. I mean it's a classic joke that -- because you're taking kids from wherever, you're assigning them at a per diem or per piece rate and they just don't know the fisheries for the most part; that's one. Number two, the one does not show Charter

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and Party boat, people who don't know shark A from shark B or species A from species B; it's your recreational fishermen who are not addressed here.

I mean that these are the people -- and I don't mean that in any derogatory sense, they are not on the water enough, it's not their occupation, it's an avocation, and if they get an unusual species, they very easily tend to misidentify it, whether it be in Tuna or whether it be in sharks.

And Frank -- next to me here -- Frank Blount mentioned a training program similar to some sort of a CD or a DVD would be very helpful, similar to what we have in some of the areas for safety with putting on survival gear and the proper procedure. I mean -- and you could probably there get to everybody one way or the other whether you sell or distribute that, say, with your HMS license you give out a DVD on how to protect these species and how to release these species and what have you.

If you look at our VTR, certainly in our area and I've tagged and released, I'm going to say many thousands of sharks over 30 years, and I don't really see any great problem with identification amongst the professionals, whether they be commercial, strictly commercial or charter and party boats. So

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

you're wasting your resources; I'd much rather see your resources go into safety. The problems in the United States commercial fleet safety is a big problem, and I'd rather see your money going there. If you had to buy guys safety gear to help them out, I'd rather see that done than waste your time here, because you're not going to solve the problem. Anyhow, if you address the groups you're mentioning in your workshop proposals, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Joe. Mike Leech?

MR. LEECH: I don't know how helpful this would be, but the IGFA has a program called the IGFA Certified Captains Program where we need to get information to professional charter captains to know for sure that they know IGFA rules and they know the different programs that IGFA has. In order to do this at a low cost, we send them out a package of information and an open book test of 75 questions. And they have to go through the material in order to answer the question. So we know at least they've read enough of the material to answer the question; it works for us it doesn't cost much money. We have about 325 certified captains in 35 countries. That might be one thing to consider, maybe not for turtles,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but some of the other less crucial types of things where you don't have to actually have them in a room.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Would it be possible to get a sample package of the materials? I'll see if I can pass the test. Okay, next we have Rusty Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed Shark. Last year the Directed Shark commercial industry wound up taking a million-dollar gross reduction available quota, mostly large coastal shark. The reason that was given was that we were rolling back ridgeback, style from the non-ridgeback οf identification, and on the dealer level, and the fishermen's level was that we did not know what we were catching; we did not know how to identify what we were catching.

Two of twenty-two species of large coastal, sandbar and Blacktip account for two-thirds of our catch. There is another half a dozen sharks such as hammerheads, tiger sharks, lemon sharks, bull sharks, all of which we can readily identify at a bow-captain level, very easily, many years of experience. On the dealer level we have some problems with many hands handling carcasses and fins, and then identification problems when it comes to carcasses being kind of

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

generically or unidentified, or misidentified on that level. Because you rely on the dealer reports and you don't even look at the log books of the fishermen until a year or two later, it kind of puts us in a penalized position again.

And you're saying that our captains, roughly 65 to 95 vessels, that account for most of the harvest of the commercial quota, need to be certified, and I've been asking for a mandatory method to get that accomplished, so that then we can go to a more species specific allocation of the quota, which could get us back to at least '97 quota that we foster vigorously to wind up having to be saddled with for a while. We wanted to go back to the '96 quota, which would've been possible, had you used the species-specific approach or alternative when you did Amendment 1.

But because you're saying that the other 20 species besides sandbar and Blacktip, we do not know what they are. In some cases Narrowtooth, whale sharks, basking sharks, we just never catch them; never have had interactions. You at least did a good thing last year by taking five of those animals, including the Galapagos and the Bigeye Sand tiger, and putting them into an unknown status. Now we are dealing with the balance of the 22 minus the five that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

need to be individually assessed as I said at a science workshop. And we need to be able to figure out what is less than one percent of the component, the rare event animals that some people might misidentify; a big nose for instance or some other animals that are just not seen routinely. But overall our guys target sandbar or Blacktip.

So I would say that the faster you can get a certification done at least on the Directed Shark captains, to be able to prove what they know, and then do something on a dealer level so that you can get more of a species-specific approach. I would say go to the bottom leg, the fin dealer; that's the man that has to pay the big bucks that drives the average volume of these sharks, and if you could do that that would be good.

Now to put on another hat: I've had my 100ton captain's license; I've had been involved in head
boat, charter boat fisheries since the early sixties.

I think I've seen maybe two or three interactions
with turtles in that entire time; now that's thousands
of days on the ocean doing that. So just to reflect - and back to the idea of handling and safe release
methods, anything that makes our guys more environment
friendly is a good thing in my book, any kind of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

tools, any kind of techniques, because that way at least it takes the onus off of our commercial fisheries.

Commercial fisheries, in this nation, only produces roughly one-fourth of what this nation consumes. So I think we need to start looking out for the marginal profit for our business because we're the only ones that take it in the wallet. As soon as you make a regulation that may not be in our best interests, we take it in the wallet in a different way from any recreational, any environmental stake holder, any fishery manager. We get economically impacted.

The 21 percent Amendment 1 impact work out to probably over 35 percent when you count various things that occurred, gluts and different kinds of not catching the quotas, and places and stuff. We need to somehow get back to where we can make our industry solvent, so that they can make a profit again. It's been several years now, and the way your workshops are looking, the certifications are looking, the way the science is looking, you're not going to have anything for us on a positive sense until 2007 perhaps, and that's again makes it another couple of years.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Rusty. Richard Stone?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. STONE: Thank you Chris. One of the things I would suggest is that you contract with some of the industry folks to put these workshops on. I think it's much more meaningful when you're working with your peers in these kinds of efforts.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Dewey, and then Jim Donofrio.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: When you look at species identification, I think you're kind of barking up the wrong tree about who's not identifying the species. If you take a look at different states, you see unclassified for shark. It should not be unclassified for shark. If the states can't tell you what the heck they're landing then you all come up with a configuration of what their landing based on, this or that, but you look at the amount of sharks that the states are landing as unclassified. I'd venture to say that probably, none of us are perfect but for the most part of identifying sharks, it isn't the fisherman. You don't even look at our log books for a couple of years, so how can you come here and tell us that we're the problem in identifying the species. You go look at the SMURF survey, or the Marine Statistical Survey, about the dusky sharks or the recreational industry landing in excess of two or

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

three or four thousands sharks.

I mean, do you really think that the recreational industry is landing that many dusky sharks, or prohibited species? Because if you did, you'd do something about it. So obviously you don't believe it. You look at your identification; sharks are probably one of the hardest to identify, because a lot of them look alike. I do applaud you for your guide, your colorful guide, because it's been kind of interesting, I have one in my boat looking at it. But I think you need to go to your states and your dealers, for there should not be a shark as unclassified; it should be a minimal amount, not thousands or thousands of pounds. That's pathetic.

As far as the mandatory workshops, I agree with the different ones that said about working we somehow, you know, if they say like say, April 15th you've got to go to a workshop, and there is a chance to go fishing, more likely you would go fishing, because of the economic impact that you all have forced upon us. Mainly your closures and different things. So give some flexibility there, the best way possible, because if it comes a chance to make a dollar versus to come to one of your workshop, I'm sure probably people would have to go and make the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

dollar. But I really looked at your -- some of these identifications, it'd be neat if the National Marine Fisheries could come out with the state landings of sharks, and put it out there, unclassified and stuff like that, because I don't think it is the fisherman that's got the problem with identification. It don't appear with all the data that you have, so I kind of think it's somewhere else. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Dewey. Jim Donofrio?

MR. DONOFRIO: Thanks, Chris, I agree with Captain Rom Whitaker's comments. My own experience of 23 years as a charter captain, last ten of it spent mainly in offshore waters, saw lot of turtles, never encountered them, never hooked them. I've been surrounded by schools of marine mammals, particularly different dolphin types, trawling for Blue Marlin, never snagged one, never had one come and take a lure. I mean I just think it's a waste of your resources. I agree with Joe, if you want to send a little educational piece out to the captains, that's one thing, but we're at a time now where recreational data collection is the foremost thing on our screen. We'd like to see money put into that, so we can get good numbers, and not educating charter boat captains on

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

something they never run into. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Jim. Since we had started with Nelson, we've got two more over here, and off Glenn, maybe three, then we'll give a short reply segment, so then we can move on to our next issue. So Ramon?

Ramon Bonfil, MR. BONFIL: Thanks Chris. Wildlife Conservation Society. It is clear to me that many of the comments that have been heard here today are very useful. From my point of view, trying to force the industry to put all the time necessary for these four different types of workshops is just too much of a burden. I think that the way to go is to prioritize what are the most important of these workshops and try to see if some of them can be avoided as a mandatory thing and done in a way in which interactive through the internet, or through videos or DVDs. Because definitely as many of the members of the panel have expressed here, the captains and crews cannot just spend a whole year attending workshops. So that's the first point that I wanted to make.

In an effort to try to prioritize these things, I think, at least from my particular point of view, the last two workshops, the one on compliance

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and understanding of HMS regulations, and probably the third one, the one on protected resources and by-catch interactions, probably are the two ones that are more amenable to be dealt with via videos, DVDs and interactive ways.

In my particular opinion also, the species identification, particularly one of sharks, is something that in my experience -- and I've been dealing with this in several instances, training personal identifications of sharks -- is not something that is done efficiently with a guide.

The guide that you guys produced is wonderful; it is a very nice instrument when you know what the sharks are already, when you already have previous knowledge. Probably for most of the crews of the commercial boats, it's going to be very useful. But as many members here have expressed, how do we deal with the people inland that are checking these things and that's another very important point here.

I think NMFS has to really identify where their weak link is: is it the crews, is it the captains, is it the people who are collecting the data on shore? And target specifically that group for the training on species identification. And in my perspective, this has to be a in-person training for

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that target group because it is very, very difficult to show even with good photographs or with good videos, what two or three different sharks look like.

You have to see them alive -- well, not alive, they're dead -- but you have to see the animals, their carcasses and explain the different characteristics with real examples, not only with just photographs or nice drawings.

So from that point of view I think we could prioritize things by making the first two workshops, I'm not saying necessarily mandatory, but in-person, something that is essentially dealt with by attending. The only thing that worries me a little bit is maybe just a technical matter of wording in the document for the second type of workshops, the ones on protective resources and by-catch interactions. It says at some point on page 45 that the workshops would likely include other protected resources.

I would like the "likely" to be deleted.

I'm saying -- I mean we need and we want Smalltooth

Swordfish and whales and others to be included in

these workshops. So if these workshops are going to

take place I don't want it that it says like a "Maybe,

if we can we'll deal with the -- these other species."

I think turtles are not the only important

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

species in the by-catch. As Sonja said rightfully, at least Toothfish is an extremely important species that has to be addressed. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you. Jack Devnew, and I do note that Shana Beemer has joined us, or Shana Miller. And she doesn't have a room at the table as of yet, maybe we can see if we can squeeze you in. There is a spot up here, but didn't want to skip over you just because I couldn't see you. So Jack Devnew, please?

MR. DEVNEW: Good morning, Chris, thanks. Just a couple of observations here with the proposed workshops. I guess number 1 would be that -- again, to the extent that the Sea Turtle release and disentanglement for the Longline fisheries is mandatory, I would suggest that that be confined to owners and captains.

I think it's very burdensome and with very little effective required crewmembers to be there. I would also suggest that there be flexibility retained in that, so that there's different times available. Again, as Rusty pointed out and some others, it's important that when you can make money these days, that you be able to do that.

In fact, I didn't get to mention yesterday

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on the objectives but I think one of the objectives ought to be and it has deal with safety at sea that Joe also brought up is, if you're going to have a fishery, it has to be an economically viable and healthy fishery. It has to provide an opportunity to reinvest money into the boats, into the gear, into the safety equipment.

We see it all the time in my business is you have a much higher incidence of injury and death at sea when you have a financially stressed fishery or industry. It's a dangerous occupation in the best of times, with all the best equipment. But when you, -- and it's a fine line but there has to be a sensitivity to it, okay. There just has to be. You take a look at -- most people know what happened with the Northern Edge recently the scalloper that was in the closed area, okay? It was actually a mandatory trip into the closed area.

And the regulation was such that last year there was 120 days, about 84 of which were in closed area trips, mandatory closed area trips, and there was -- I mean, no poundage restrictions or anything like that. You had to take those trips, you needed to take them, the problem was if you came out of the closed area, you're forfeited the rest of the trip, okay? So

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

they stayed there. Boat sinks; seven men died.

and they took a trip that spanned the 2004 year with the 2005 scallop year. They left on February 27th. They were told that that -- no, the fishery service has relaxed that rule to allow them in weather, you know, finally, and then go back in without forfeiting days. All right? This guy couldn't do that because he actually left two days before the old year. All right, takes out the pilothouse window, lucky somebody didn't get killed, okay? And he -- because he stayed in the area in bad weather.

That doesn't apply necessarily here, but to the extent that the compendium of regulations require that you miss good opportunities to maintain a economically healthy fishery, then that's the kind of situation that you create. So I would appreciate Joe's comments and sensitivity to it but -- so I would caution that you please maintain some flexibility with that.

It certainly seems -- certainly from the comments around the table that the chartered boats and the recreational fisheries don't have any appreciable level of interaction with protected resources and turtles. However, I have talked with some of the head

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

boats down in the South and I think that they do have some and perhaps, instead of a mandatory situation with them, perhaps invite them to some of the other workshops that are ongoing and -- so that they can participate for instance, in you know, the Longline gear. I mean disentangling a turtle is disentangling a turtle and it doesn't really matter what particular venue is offered but perhaps, you know, a little outreach to them to -- on a voluntary basis. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Glenn anything? Shana? Welcome to the table. Just a few more comments because we want to move into our next area. So Nelson, Bob -- Nelson, Gail, Bob Pride.

MR. BEIDEMAN: A couple of things. First of all, I appreciate the, you know, charter boat and recreational, but it's an extremely rare event to interact with either a Sea Turtle or a marine mammal. In my experience I've interacted with one Sea Turtle and one marine mammal, both when I was in teenage while recreational and charter boat fishing.

But you need to realize that, for many in the pelagic Longline fishery; it's the exact same situation. There are pelagic Longliners that have fished all their lives and have never interacted with

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

a marine mammal or have never interacted with a Sea Turtle. Now, that is getting fewer and fewer as populations increase. There's more interactions, but these are endangered species and we do have to take it very, very seriously.

On something that Joe brought up, I think there's been very little discussion of but it's actually the most important factor. And we'll try and get into it more when we talk about circle hooks, but what's taking place with NOAA fisheries and some of the regional or international bodies et cetera, reaching out to international fleets on circle hooks and careful handling and release is really where it counts.

And there is a very extensive on NOAA fisheries working with different environmental groups. I know World Wildlife Fund is very much involved than others, and there's been dozens and dozens of training workshops, ITTCs. Even they're training in -- if you give them a J hook, you know, a rusty J hook, any size, anything, they will give you a brand new circle hook to use.

But that's where it really counts when we have a solution, and yes, we're adopting it with the 5 percent of effort that we are, but we're reaching out

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to that 95 percent of fishing effort in the Atlantic, that's most important. And it looks like it's got a real good chance with circle hooks and these turtles. And the wonderful thing about circle hooks is that the benefit goes across not just turtles and marine mammals but all species, secondary species that are to be released. So it's just amazing stuff. And it's actually making a difference.

The third thing is I wanted to encourage Chris to have some public comment on this, but I know he's moving hard to -- whenever the public comment is, perhaps they can also have comment on the workshop issues.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you. Yes, we do need to move along, so we have Gail and Bob Pride, and then what I'll propose is rather than take a break as we're just getting started, what we'll do is we'll move up Essential Fish Habitat before we take a break. And then we'll get into the time/area closures after the break. So Gail and Bob.

MS. JOHNSON: This is just a real quick question. I keep hearing people taking about either VTRs or VTIs. What are they?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: VTRs are the Northeast Regional Offices, basically vessel -- a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

vessel trip report. Okay. Bob Pride?

MR. PRIDE: Thank you, Chris. I want to follow up on what Dewey was talking about. He and I had a conversation yesterday about how sharks were landed in Virginia. So I went and looked on the web last night and got the 2003 report from our mandatory reporting system. All our commercial fishermen in Virginia have to report monthly on their catches and it was kind of interesting.

The catch -- this is 2003, which was the last full year that was on the web. I didn't want to go through it month by month, but there were 350,000 pounds of sharks caught, other than dogfish sharks. And of those, 40,000 pounds had a specific species identification; 40,000 pounds were identified as large coastal only. In other words, no breakdown on what kind of species, and 275,000 pounds were identified as unclassified.

So that means that 315,000 pounds out of 350,000 pounds had no species identification. I mean it's just incredible. And this by the way, Dewey, is not the fish dealers or the state; this is the individual fishermen reporting. And I suppose it's because the state doesn't require the breakdown. And I'll talk to Travis too (phonetic) when I get back.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Interestingly too, this is just an aside, it doesn't have much to do with the discussion, but it was interesting.

There were 907,000 pounds of dogfish landed, unclassified 209, spiny 9300, and then smooth dogs 694,000. I didn't think we had that many in Virginia. But that's another story. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you much for the discussion on workshops, and yes, we do have a public comment period planned for later this morning. So we can come back to the workshops again during that period. So what we -- I'd like to do now is move into the Essential Fish Habitat discussion, which we had on the agenda for 10:30.

But again, not wanting to take the break at this point and knowing that the time/area closures will take a little bit more time to discuss; I thought we could knock off Essential Fish Habitat first. So Chris Rilling will give us a presentation on what is required under Magnuson Act with respect to five-year review of Essential Fish Habitat. Thanks, Chris.

MR. RILLING: Thank you, Chris. Just to go through some of the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevenson Act for Essential Fish Habitat. The MSA defines EFH as habitat necessary for spawning,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

breeding, feeding, and growth to maturity. And under the Magnuson-Stevenson Act, NMFS is required to identify and describe EFH for all species in the fishery, identify habitat areas of particular concern, which are subsets of EFH areas that are particularly vulnerable to degradation, maybe a rare habitat type, or are ecologically important.

Third component of the MSA requires us to identify fishing and non-fishing impacts to EFH and to minimize to the extent practicable impacts of adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing impacts on EFH. And then finally, the MSA requires us to conduct a complete review of all Essential Fish Habitat information every five years and make updates as necessary. That is the portion of the Act that we're currently focusing on in this draft amendment.

Just to point out the importance of our Essential Fish Habitat designations, they're really one of the few mechanisms that we have to provide comment on and potentially mitigate such activities like oil and gas development in the Gulf of Mexico, for instance. So this is a fairly important thing in terms of how we identify, describe, and map those Essential Fish Habitat areas for our species.

Just to give you a little bit of background

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and history on our EFH, the original EFH descriptions for HMS were published in the 1999 HMS FMP, that was for Tuna, Swordfish, and sharks. Billfish EFH areas were described in Amendment 1 to the Billfish FMP, and several HAPCs were described for sandbar sharks also in the original '99 FMP.

Additionally, EFH for five shark species, sandbar, Blacktip, dusky, nurse, and Finetooth were updated in Amendment 1 to the HMS FMP in 2003. And currently we're conducting a five-year EFH review for all remaining Atlantic HMS that weren't updated in Amendment 1 to the FMP.

Our review process is composed of several different facets. The first is obviously data collection, and what we're doing is compiling all the state, federal, and non-governmental data that we can get our hands on, and this includes, for instance, the pelagic Longline logbook data, observer program data, tagging program data, and data from individual researchers and institutions.

The second phase is to take that data and map and analyze any changes that we can see in the data from the areas that were originally identified in 1999. In order to do that, we're using a geographic information system, GIS, plotting all our observed

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

distribution points from all those different data sets and overlaying them on the existing 1999 EFH boundaries. That is what we will be providing in the draft amendment in addition to any of the textual descriptions of the Essential Fish Habitat boundaries.

And then finally, the last step would be reviewing all of that information we have. In other words, looking for areas in which boundaries may have changed, altered due to migrations, change in habitat requirements for particular species or life stages, or perhaps simply new information reflecting that there may have been changes in where those species are either spawning, feeding, or being at critical periods of their life cycle

Just to give you an idea of what to look for when you are reviewing our maps in the draft EIS, here you have an example of the juvenile Swordfish distributions. And on the right you can see all of the different data sources that we relied on and these are abbreviated, but essentially POP would be Pelagic Observer Program and these are defined in the draft amendment that you have, or the pre-draft -- excuse me.

CTS, the Cooperative Tagging System, which is running by NMFS, at the Southeast Fisheries Science

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Center, CST, Cooperative Shark Tagging Program, SCM, the South Carolina data collection process, SOP, the Shark Observer Program. And then we've also broken down the observed distributions by gender. So you see the number of males and females reported as well as those for which there may have not been a sex determination.

So plotting these data maps on and underneath you can see the hashed areas, represent the 1999 Essential Fish Habitat boundaries. Juvenile Swordfish is a classic example of where we are seeing distributions that were not reflected in the 1999 boundaries, as you can see up along the northeast coast. So this is one that we would be looking at in more detail in trying to determine whether that area is in fact a critical habitat for either spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth maturity and whether there is any chance to the boundary that might be warranted.

Similarly, for another example, adult Swordfish, obviously not as many data points recorded. And largely dependent again, we are upon data, distributional presence-absence of information. One of the deficits in our knowledge and understanding really has to do with mapping specific

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

area where that are non-spawning or non-critical habitat areas for some of these species.

So we do tend to rely to a large degree on distribution data from all the different data sources that we have available. So here you can see the 1999 EFH boundaries for adult Swordfish overlaid with the new and old distribution points.

Here is the map for the spawning areas for Swordfish and you'll notice a lack of actual concrete data points. And again, this is something where we had to rely on anecdotal information, knowledge about where critical spawning habitat for some of our HMS is. And also employing essentially a precautionary approach to try and capture all those areas that might be most important to those different life stages.

So what we would be looking for at this point in terms of our data review is additional information that might confirm the actual locations for spawning habitat for HMS, additional literature or anecdotal or scientific information from individual researchers that would help confirm, or conversely, help us to either refine or expand those boundaries, depending on the information that's out there.

Continuing with our review what we've done to this point is consulted with NMFS technical experts

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on interpretation of the data that we've mapped thus far and we're relying on them to help us at least make an initial determination as to whether any of the boundaries need to be modified. So at this point in the draft EIS we will not be proposing alternatives to actually modify the boundary.

Instead, what we are doing is simply reviewing all of the new information that's been compiled since the last designations were made in 1999. And based on our review of that information, trying to come to a conclusion as to whether changes to the boundaries and descriptions are warranted.

If we come to that conclusion in this EIS, then we would need to follow up with the subsequent rulemaking or another document to actually modify those boundaries. And at that point we would be proposing NEPA alternatives for how to actually delineate those areas.

So it's a slight change from what you are reading in the draft, the pre-draft at this point because there we did actually list some alternatives. In addition to looking at boundary modifications, we will be examining fishing and non-fishing impacts comprehensively once again. It's a huge undertaking because we have to look at not only HMS gears but

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

gears from other FMPs as in federally managed fisheries as well as state managed fisheries.

As you all imagine there are a lot of gears out there and the good news, at least for HMS or at least most HMS, is that since our habitats are primarily delineated in water column areas, pelagic or epipelagic areas, most of those gears do not have any significant impacts upon HMS EFH. But nonetheless, we do have to go through actually documenting what all those gears are and any potential impacts.

Finally, in revising any EFH boundaries, we may also be looking at habitat areas of particular concern. We will be looking at potential manipulation of fishing impacts as well. And changes to those boundaries might be proposed in a subsequent document as I mentioned.

What we will be looking for from you all at this point, what we've asked our technical reviewers is to identify any additional EFH information that might lead us to conclude that boundaries or descriptions should be modified.

So what we would ask is that you go through each of the different maps and descriptions once they are published in the draft EIS and provide us with any information that you may have or comments on the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

necessary modifications to those boundaries. We're also looking for any additional publications, ongoing research and any other data that the AP may be aware of that should be incorporated and considered in this review.

And finally, just the overall bigger question is to address any gaps in our understanding of where HMS EFH is and what we can do to fill those gaps. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Chris. Let's take comments for about 10 or 15 minutes on this topic unless we need a bit more than that, but I imagine we can do that then take a break and then come back to a very similar discussion on area closures, obviously, to protect species and avoid by-catch issues but also some relation to Essential Fish Habitat. So why don't I go down this way this time, just to be fair and balanced?

Again, we will take questions on the Essential Fish Habitat five-year review. So, Bob Hueter?

MR. HEUTER: Thank you, Chris. Chris, right? It is Chris, right? Yes. I found your comment about the value of this for dealing with such things as oil and gas development to be interesting

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and insightful because I think this has been in place now for five years, I believe. Right? So I think the perception is that this EFH effort has been very descriptive and has been a process of data assimilation but it has not yet been used in any meaningful way in terms of fisheries management. That it's cataloguing information to be used in case of these other interactions with other types of human activities.

Now, you mentioned that the process is underway though to look at what the impacts are. It has been five years; could you give us a timetable as to when EFH will become part of the actual fisheries management process to look at area closures, time closures, gear restrictions, and that sort of thing?

MR. RILLING: Well, we have incorporated some of our Essential Fish Habitat information into, for instance, time/area closure analyses like we did off of North Carolina for sandbar sharks. So we have relied on that information, as you will see in the next presentation regarding time/area closures. That's clearly one of the key aspects of information that we're relying upon to identify potential time/area closures for species like blue and White Marlin or other HMS.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

24 25

23

So I would say that we are incorporating the EFH information that we have into some of our management decisions.

MR. HEUTER: Can I -- just to follow-up, would you say that that's being done in an activist way right now or is it more of a reactive? When you hear about a problem then you go to the EFH information?

MR. RILLING: Well, in terms of Amendment 1, it was, I believe, proactive. We've identified an area that we thought there were impacts going on and took action to try and to address those impacts. So I would say in a way it's a combination of both, we do try to be proactive, obviously. Sometimes we are reacting to certain events that come along.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Bobbi Walker, welcome back.

MS. WALKER: Thank you. Are you going to address or have you addressed the open loop LNG terminals in the Gulf of Mexico?

MR. RILLING: Yes, we have provided the Agency, through the southeast regional office, had provided comments on that project, including the concerns about HMS eggs and larva being trained and, I guess you could say, frozen through that process with

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

an open loop. Those comments had been provided. I understand the permit was issued for at least one of the facilities regardless, but we'll have to do some better work. As Bob Hueter pointed out, it's not just a data collection or cataloguing exercise; it's actually looking at ways to apply this in the future.

So whether we can come up with better quantitative models of what eggs and larvae would be lost to those types of activities. I know that had been done to some extent for certain other Gulf species that would be affected by that operation.

But we hadn't been in a position of having enough data or advance modeling techniques in order to be able to comment in a quantitative sense exactly what the effects would be from that particular operation. But as more and more oil and gas development activities will be undertaken in the Gulf, it's clearly a situation where we need to do better, to be able to provide comments in a quantitative sense to gauge those impacts.

MS. WALKER: And it concerned me, Chris, when I looked at the maps and I saw that the juvenile Swordfish, I think, are -- it's right in the middle of the terminal that's already been approved. And now we've just got to rash of them that are requesting

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

approval.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Ellen Peel?

MS. PEEL: Chris, do you -- to that same point in the Gulf; we are hearing quite a bit of concern expressed by anglers there. Do you -- are copies of your comments available and -- that you turned in to -- in response to these proposals?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Actually, I don't have it with me, but the Coast Guard, since they were issuing the permit, had a very good website, which -- basically what we call an electronic docket including all comments received. So I'll make sure that we get that website for you before you leave and it's actually something -- a model that I would like to see the division be able to get to in terms of posting comments online as they come in along with all the decision documents.

I believe Russ said he has a copy of the comments with him, so -- but again, that website is a pretty good model for those that I have seen in the electronic rulemaking arena. Continuing in this counterclockwise direction, Rich Ruais on Essential Fish Habitat. Your mike working yet? I don't know if we --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Tape interruption.)

MR. RUAIS: -- Mexico considered fish habitat for Bluefin Tuna spawning there. Is it in another document and I'm just missing it?

MR. RILLING: Yes, in the pre-draft we only provided the map for the three different Swordfish life stages that we're looking at, but we will be providing all of the HMS species maps and EFH descriptions in the draft EIS. So it was in the original 1999 HMS FMP. And it is identified as EFH in the Gulf of Mexico.

MR. RUAIS: Okay. Thank you. And the second part is what kinds of information would you need to modify the boundaries to make the Gulf of Maine Essential Fish Habitat for Bluefin Tuna for feeding purposes, to stop industrialized forage fishing?

MR. RILLING: Well, obviously we'd want as much data as we can, not just observed distributions, but additional information regarding that particular facet of Bluefin Tuna biology. So we would be looking for any scientific publications, literature, and obviously, input from you all or our technical experts in Bluefin Tuna biology.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

certainly we'll include the materials that were presented at the Maine Fishermen's Forum; things like the stomach contents showing the portion of -- or frequency of occurrence of herring as the forage base, things like that, as well as some of the oceanographic information that might be useful in explaining and describing the EFHas opposed to just presence/absence, because obviously that would be limited by your observer program if the observed sets aren't taking into account the full range or something like that. So you really do need to reach beyond things like log books and observer reports.

Just a quick backtrack, we'll go clockwise for a second. Louis Daniel?

MR. DANIEL: I'm sorry. I got my clockwise and my counterclockwise mixed up. How do you rank HAPCs? I notice that, for example, the HAPC for sandbar sharks occurs off North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and New Jersey. How do you rank the importance of an HAPC, to close one and not another?

MR. RILLING: I wouldn't say that we rank one area higher than another. I think what we were looking at in terms of North Carolina is a confluence of different factors; observed catches of juvenile sandbar sharks, catches of prohibited dusky sharks as

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

well as the HAPC areas. I wouldn't say that we actually rank the different areas. I would think they all play a more or less equal role.

MR. DANIEL: Does that not just contradict what you just described? I mean, if the characteristics that make the area off of North Carolina an HAPC are those combined factors, it would seem like those same factors would exist in other HAPCs or else they wouldn't be HAPCs for sandbar sharks.

MR. RILLING: Well, that's correct. But I'm assuming you're asking the question with regard to the implementation of the time/area closure. So we didn't obviously implement time/area closures for the other HAPC areas largely because they were in state waters, largely because we didn't have the additional information that we had off of North Carolina. So that's what I was trying to say.

But in terms of the actual identification of HAPC areas, we didn't go through a ranking process in determining the three different areas. They were simply based upon biological characteristics of the species within that area. Now, they do rank higher obviously than the Essential Fish Habitat areas, if that's what your question is.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So HAPCs are essentially subsets of Essential Fish Habitat areas that meet the requirements that I outlined at the beginning of my talk.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Looks like there is a -- more request for backtrack. Why don't we go back to the counterclockwise? And then we'll catch you up on the counterclockwise rotation. I believe Ken Hinman was next.

MR. HINMAN: Okay. Thank you, Chris, and the other Chris. First of all, I will second Rich's recommendation about -- I think it's a good recommendation that the availability of critical forage on, you know, in time and space be considered for possible designation as EFH or HAPC or that kind of thing. I think it's definitely worth looking at.

I think there are some current situations where you could begin. My real comment is about -- it has always bothered me since 1999 that the designations of EFH for HMS have -- the boundaries have ended at the EEZ, and I guess this was some NOAA General Council decision.

But it seems to me in a document for Atlantic highly migratory species, which goes to great lengths describing and recognizing the broad range of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

these fish and the fishing activities throughout the Atlantic and the fishing mortality that goes on beyond the EEZ.

And the fact that a lot of this is really to build a case for us taking, building a strategy for getting international cooperation to conserve highly migratory species, that our identification designation of EFH for these species should extend beyond EFA, beyond the EEZ. There's too many goddamn acronyms in my -- you could make a whole sentence with just acronyms.

But I think, yes, I think that's really something. I don't know what the legal basis for that was, but it seems to me that we should really be looking at critical spawning areas for Blue Marlin, for example, or nursery areas for Swordfish, that we shouldn't just stop at the boundary. We should look at where they are.

Our boats fish beyond our EEZ and we know most of the fishing mortality for a lot of these fish takes place beyond that. So I think it's something that's important to be in this document so we can build an international case for protecting areas that are important to the fish or fishing boat. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Ken. Yes, that is important and certainly part of our strategies at ICCAT in dealing with protected areas or closed areas on an international basis. And we will see what acronym we could coin to talk about EFH beyond the EEZ and use that appropriately in the document. Nelson and Ramon -- or Nelson, Glenn, Jack, Ramon.

MR. BEIDEMAN: Yes, that's Blue Water's primary comment as well, is that we need to remember that these highly migratories have to be managed internationally, and to build up the information on the international, even more important than EEZ. But also one other thing is that as we build up this information until we have all the information to look at, we have to be careful not to jump to -- well, this is the primary spawning area, because what we're identifying is that spawning is taking place in this area.

But it may not be the most intense spawning activity that's observed when you talk Atlantic-wide. It may be by our fleet, in our experience, but it still doesn't take in the full picture, and until that picture is built for a highly migratory species, then we shouldn't make too many assumptions.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Nelson. That is a good point, that we may identify significant areas within our EEZ, but they may not be the more significant areas. And we would need to pursue those internationally. Glenn Delaney?

MR. DELANEY: Yes, a couple of things. First, I think it's intriguing to look at the forage issue in an area that is of critical importance for feeding of a highly migratory species to be designated as Essential Fish Habitat for the forage side of the argument, but I think you have to be a little cautious also in getting -- falling into a trap that if that area is Essential Fish Habitat for the feeding of a highly migratory species, it would presumably or conceivably apply both to the forage and the predator. And so you might want to think about where that line is taking you. The act of feeding -- I mean we fish where fish feed, so think about that.

Second question is -- well, I have three.

One is -- I guess, a statement more -- that I'm a little concerned on the one hand that we're still in this Essential Fish Habitat trap, and maybe it's because Congress and the administration hasn't -- is yet to really modify the statute on this. But we're still falling into the trap that the mere existence or presence of eggs, larvae, juveniles, and adults

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

defines Essential Fish Habitat. And, you know, for a highly migratory species that takes the absurdity of that to the extreme, because we have, you know, we have a Gulf Stream, for example, that's just bursting larvae. I mean that's larvae soup out there for every highly migratory species there is.

And that tends to distribute those fairly broadly. But on the other hand it's hard to imagine most pelagic-style gear or trawling gear to really have much impact on the habitat itself. Question is, you know, at what point do you cross over into defining the habitat as the creature itself, the existence or presence of the creature itself? And that seems to be what you're getting at here, and that's a concern.

And the last thing is Magnuson Act is likely to be amended in this Congress, Essential Fish Habitat and habitat, areas of particular concern definitions, and how it's going to be used in this process. It's likely to be altered, if not somewhat dramatically, and this may be something proposed by the administration itself. We're waiting to see what you guys propose to Congress in terms of Magnuson Act reauthorization amendments.

I think they're holding off until after this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

conference later this week to do that. Certainly the Senate has indicated a desire to work with us in the House as well, and really focus on Essential Fish Habitat. So I don't know what you do, but we could go through this whole process, end up with a result in, you know, a very short time, after which the whole statutory basis for what you just did is changed.

And I don't know if that forces Amendment 3 or -- so you might want to keep that in mind. It's not that you can differ or not follow your responsibilities under the statute, but it seems almost a silly exercise if it's all going to have to be redone six months later.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, as Chris pointed out, this is only phase 1 of our five-year review. So we would anticipate that should Congress act swiftly, we would be able to incorporate that new baseline or basis for evaluation in the phase 2 of our Essential Fish Habitat review. Jack Devnew?

MR. DEVNEW: Thanks, Chris. I find myself agreeing with all of the previous speakers basically, and, you know, in particular, Ken's comments as well as Nelson's and Glenn's here. Congress in its wisdom excluded highly migratory species from exclusive jurisdiction of the United States when the Act was

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

established.

I think actually what we're -- you know, and as part of that whole Act, we have this element of it, which is this discussion on the Essential Fish Habitat. Actually, I would say that in the absence of creating your charts, that you have posted up here and are contained in here, if you do not take into account the entire range of a species, it is a totally inappropriate chart to be included in there.

What you're doing is taking a snapshot of a small portion of the range of that thing and creating an inordinate amount of importance to that area and discounting the rest of the range of that species. What that leads to is a total misconception in the eyes of the reader, the person that's going to be --

(Tape interruption)

MR. DEVNEW: -- This is from the esophagus or stomach and potentially leaving a hole there or a rip in the tissue, or leaving that hook in. As you can see on the slides, well maybe you can't tell the relative size of some of those hooks but -- I mean I guess the fisherman who are familiar with it will know, but they're, you know, about that big. So, if that's stuck in your throat, that's not going to be that great either. So, the biologists are discussing

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it to figure out what would be best and --

SPEAKER: As a --

MR. DEVNEW: Provide further guidance.

Okay, as a further note, the J hooks of course appear smaller than they used to a decade or two ago I guess. That's just my assumption based on my knowledge of the circle hooks and stuff like that. But, I'm just wondering overall what's your message about using dehooking devices from what you have seen so far; is it -- seems to be fairly successful, looks like you removed almost all the external hooks?

MR. DEVNEW: The devices that we have have been very successful so far, I would say. The only aspect where we would need more work is on the ingested hooks; those are the most difficult to get out. But prior to this, it was almost impossible to get the hooks off or a lot of the gear off some of these turtles when they are in the water. some of this work and some of the fishermen's own efforts prior to that, they were using these poles to try to, you know, cut some of the line around the flipper and release it with less gear.

Until this year we didn't really have a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

23

24

successful way of getting a lot of the hooks out from turtles in the water or even some on the boats. So this data shows a fairly significant increase in the amount of hooks and gear removed from the turtles, which we feel is a positive step in improving their release, decrease in their post-release mortality.

SPEAKER: So part of the turtles, you did both, probably the smaller ones, but you had a pretty decent success rate of dealing with the bigger animals in the water then, is what you're saying?

MR. DEVNEW: Yes. Did you want to speak to the hook question?

SPEAKER: The hook is 2 1/8th inch wide, which has a significance in relation to the size -- loggerhead turtles that we interact with: 2 1/8th inch wide.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Bob McAuliffe?

MR. McAULIFFE: This is a little of the subject but has anybody tried that dehooking device on a human; on one of the fishermen?

SPEAKER: I don't think that would go over well though.

SPEAKER: Well, we'll consider that in the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

core report.

MR. McAULIFFE: Actually, it's not that farfetched, because they've actually removed hooks, veterinarians, out of birds and things like that, so if a person hooked themselves --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Let's hope that it wasn't deeply ingested.

MR. DEVNEW: This technology they have for dehooking these turtles is also effective for large finfish, you know, like marlins or tunas or stuff like that. You probably wouldn't need the polemounted ones, but some of these hand-mounted ones in the bottom picture, they're saying they're very effective for getting hooks out of finfish.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: And Sonja?

SPEAKER: Well, to facilitate getting hooks out of myself and to release fish quicker, whether they are going in an igloo or overboard, I've squished all the barbs off my hooks and haven't missed catching any fish. I wonder if the industry has tried removing barbs from hooks; whether they still catch fish or not, I don't know.

MS. FORDHAM: Sonja Fordham, the Ocean Conservancy. I have to admit, the pie charts, I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

can't read up there or in front of me, so I hope I'm not missing any bad news. But I just wanted to say, I'm -- obviously, this is really exciting and encouraging news. And I think clearly NMFS and the researchers and the Longline industry should be commended. And you may know, we have a sea turtle scientist working at our organization, Marydele Donnelly; I haven't been able to talk to her, she's at the Seattle meeting.

But I know that she's expressed real interest and hope about this study so, I would send that forward. And we're both interested in helping to promote such changes with other fleets from other nations. And to that end, the Committee on Fisheries at the FAO is meeting in a week or two. And I think that's the environmental community, mУ organization is interested in working, not just international NGOs, but also the fishing industry to promote these -- this kind of work. And so I would encourage any specific suggestions on how we might do that. And I know that turtles are going to be on the agenda at COFI, and I don't think we're all committed to this idea of an international plan of action for turtles for a variety of reasons, but that we are

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

interested in FAO having a role, and this might be right up that alley.

So I would encourage anyone with any specific suggestions on what we might try to get out of this COFI meeting to talk to -- directly to either me or Justin LeBlanc (phonetic) is the industry rep, or of course the National Marine Fisheries Service of the State Department, thank you.

SPEAKER: I thought it was very interesting and appears to have made some progress, and I'm wondering, translating it into the real world, are any of these changes going to be now required of the, at least the U.S. fleet to begin with and then hopefully try to negotiate with ICCAT to get them beyond the fleet. Otherwise if you don't translate it to the real world and put it to use, all it is is an interesting science project.

MR. DEVNEW: The experiment was approved for a three-year duration, and we've just completed the second year, so, I would say that we have good indication that some of these measures are very effective, and in order to reopen the NED area to the Longline fleet, we have to implement a measure that - or measures that would reduce mortality by 55

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

percent. So it is our intention to go forward with the measures that are effective and try to have that area reopened by 2004, which would be -- well, the experiment would end in 2003, so that's our tentative target date.

And as for the international aspects, that is a significant factor and focus of this experiment. As Bill Hogarth mentioned earlier, there's a meeting in Seattle that's going on right now where the National Marine Fisheries Service provided travel funds for scientists from some Asian countries and some European countries to attend with the specific focus of trying to transfer some of this technology, or at least encourage some similar research efforts in those countries. So I'm not sure --

SPEAKER: Certain elements are already required.

MR. DEVNEW: Oh, right. Certain elements like dip nets and line cutters are already required on the Longline fleet as well as handling and release guidelines that are posted in the wheelhouse. So, we're slowly making progress.

MS. GRAY: Thank you, Charlotte Gray from Oceana. Well, I am very encouraged by the numbers on

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

this sheet. I do have some questions, and I'm not sure actually if Tyson (phonetic) or Nelson might be able to answer at least the first one more easily. But as for the zero offset or no offset -- I just wanted to -- I'm assuming circle hook -- was that the same size hook that was used in the Azores, (phonetic) study two years ago?

MR. BEIDEMAN: Not two years ago, but the Azores did look at the 180, in 2002.

MS. GRAY: Excuse me, yes, 2002. Because it was fairly dramatic, at least on this -- in this chart, and I'm not sure. Of course, I'd have to; I think they might've been using squid in the Azores study too that, it seems that in 80, at least -- and I realized the most important thing here is the offset, but just for comparison's sake, if there is an 87 percent reduction from the non offset or the straight circle hook in the NED, but yet I believe in the Azores study there was no significant difference when they were using the circle hook.

It tends to reason that there -- these studies may be in conflict, not seen as it -- 87 is a pretty dramatic reduction in catch rate. And if the idea is to export gear technologies if it works in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the NED, and this is actually a true number that it does work, and it doesn't work in the Azores, I think that's worth looking at. Because I would be, you know, I think that, I think that we need to be careful that we don't quick jump to conclusions that "Yay, we found the fix-all" when we may not have found the fix-all. And I would just put that out in front of everybody and the agency to keep in mind these different analyses. And I don't know if anybody wants to respond to that.

But then my second question is, in the beginning -- maybe I missed in the presentation -- you talked about reducing daylight soak hook time, and I didn't -- I don't know if those results are presented here and I missed them or was there a -- was that included in the hooks? I mean, was it just that that was -- the soak time was decreased for all of the control and everything, or was that actually analyzed too?

MR. DEVNEW: The soak time -- well, I guess I'll answer them backwards, or I'll answer one and pass it back to Nelson. But with regard to the soak time that wasn't incorporated in that data, the statistician working on it kind of teased it out.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Basically for those results it was found to support what was discovered in 2001, that it did have a significant reduction in loggerheads but there was no impact on leatherback turtles.

So I didn't really present that data; I was trying to keep it short and focus on some of the more effective measures. But with that there are also some other problems such as possible danger to some of the fishermen because they increase the haul back times of the gear. So it's hard to say what other impacts that might have, so I didn't touch upon it. And I don't think it's going to be a viable option. But for some of the differences with the Azores study, I was going to let Nelson speak to some of the Pelagic Longline differences or --

MR. BEIDEMAN: The sample sizes in the Azores there, as far as I've heard, is only one boat and a very small. Plus we've never seen any confidence intervals from the Azores analysis. You know, National Marine Fisheries Service has been very, very careful in this program that every step of the way is absolutely tight, dependable; the person that analyses the data is independent.

Marvin Schall (phonetic) he's from the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

pharmaceutical industry. And, you know, we've been able to maintain the 95 percent confidence, well, because of the sample sizes et cetera. One of the things that hasn't been yet tested that probably should be, but we can't test everything, you know, you can only test so many treatments a, you know, a year; it is an opposite offset. And the offset that we're working with, 10 degree offset is very slight, and it's primarily, you know, to facilitate the debating, but, you know, by the numbers you can see that the offset actually had greater reductions.

MS. GRAY: Can I just conclude? I appreciate that, and knowing these differences is definitely important. But I just again want to reiterate; and I don't at all call into question the study that happened in the NED. I think that was a fabulous cooperation, I think the researchers and observer coverage; I think that was a really good example of how we should proceed. But I also know that this is one year of data, and again this is a long term problem, and it is a worldwide problem, and so before we jump in the sack and start exporting technologies and reopening areas that are clearly important, you know, I just think we need to take all

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that into consideration. Thanks.

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR} \mbox{ CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: } \mbox{ Nelson and }$ then Glenn Delaney.

MR. BEIDEMAN: Just a quick comment. In 2003, we're looking to further replicate some of these studies to make it more robust. We're removing -- well, we're -- it's still being planned, but tentatively we're planning on removing the daylight soak time restriction to allow the fishermen to fish more like they did previously and maintaining some of the experimental measures to sort of validate that these reductions are real and that they are significant and that they are -- that they will meet the 55 percent biological opinion stipulation.

MR. DELANEY: Yes, on that issue, our mandate is 55 percent; to demonstrate 55 percent reduction in mortality. What you see up there is up to a 92 percent, and that's just in reductions in interactions. The mitigation tools are, you know, tremendously important and ever evolving, and there's a knack, you know, to getting the hooks out, and getting the gear off. And we've all been working tremendously together to, you know, learn those things.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And that's all benefits in addition to the avoidance of you know, reductions in their interactions. But we've learned so much in doing this program with the National Marine Fisheries Service, both the policy people and the researchers. It has been a tremendous experience for us and I believe, vice versa.

One thing led to another, to another to another, and it's still leading. What we've done thus far is pretty much a swordfish directed And it looks like, you know, if we can protocol. match, you know, the results for a second year that, you know, we'll have something there. There's a lot more work that needs to be done. About 80 percent of the global Pelagic Longline fishing is tuna directed. what we've learned already can Some of be transferred directly to sword-directed fisheries, if it proves out. Some of what we've learned already can be transferred to tuna-directed protocols, or research on tuna-directed protocols.

It's little bit of a tougher question but, you know, we're already, now starting to get there.

As far as the 55, and the closure, Industry has set its priority at focusing on the third year research.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And once we get the third year research, you know, if we have any brain cells left we'll think about, you know, -- we've already met the mandate in the BiOp. But our first priority is the third year research.

As far as that -- you know, there's other things that we probably won't be able to accomplish because there just simply isn't the money for it.

And you know, survivability -- post-hooking survivability is very important. In order to move this into the international arena we need to have some of that baseline information. I wish we all could put some of that research dollars into that rather than all the lawyer stuff. This year we'll also include hooking timers and time depth recorder devices that -- you know, we've pretty much had that -- manufactured it you know, for the task.

As far as COFI and suggestions, I've got a couple. We need these swordfish directed protocols tested in other areas. And it's not just these protocols, it's the awareness, it's the leaded swivel, it's about 10 percent longer than a ball-drop, you know, it's a combination of -- it's a toolbox of things. And to have these all tested in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

another swordfish directed fisheries as quickly as possible, would be a real big help.

Also, I think that, you know, we've got enough under out belt that this year for the ICCAT meeting, and this year for the IATTC meeting, where, you know, most of all, the Pelagic Longline fisheries in both oceans, you know, will be, I think we should have an information brochure, a nice colorful little pickup, you know, to begin showing some of these results and encouraging, you know, other fleets to start testing some of these things. It looks promising, it feels promising. We still have a long ways to go.

Some of what we're learning, you know, will be able to be transferred to other species, but it's going to take a lot. And it's a whole new realm for us, and we hope that we can all continue to work together. It's been a very positive experience.

SPEAKER: I'm sure Nelson said just about everything I could say, but I do want to say that I just attended a workshop two or three days down in Miami where this was discussed in very, very great detail. And it's a shame you weren't able to attend, because I think you better -- have a much better

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

feeling for just how extraordinary this science is. It's one of the -- you know, it has some of the greatest integrity, and attention to detail that I've ever seen, and certainly represents an extraordinary example of how this agency can once again begin to apply science to solving, you know, real world problems. And it's a great reflection of the current leadership of the agency and we're very grateful for that.

On the international front, I just want to reiterate Nelson's comment that in order for us to export this to the 95 or 96 percent of effort that's out there, we're going to have to first define for them that there is indeed a problem, that there is mortality from Longline interactions. And we skipped over that in the United States, because we have the Endangered Species Act, and you know, there is a presumption of guilt that until proved otherwise, you're stuck with. They don't have that or anything close to it.

And so for us to be able -- you know, as a negotiator, I'm not suggesting I would be one to that. But anyone who would have to negotiate any kind of international obligations or even voluntary

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

agreements is first going to have to cross the bridge of defining the problem. And so, post-release mortality science is in my opinion, I anticipate, central to being able to even move to the point of discussion of, okay what are the solutions to that problem, and if you use this type of gear, and this type of hook, and this size of hook, and this type of bait and, you know, daylight and all that; all the different pieces of the toolbox Nelson mentioned. And we're -- you're not even going to get to that discussion until you first define that there is indeed a problem that they should feel bad about at least. And maybe obligate themselves to a solution. Again, I reiterate that as I did down in Miami.

MR. DEVNEW: You know, thanks, Chris. Without going on, you know, any further, I certainly support the statements made around the table as to the positiveness of this effort here, and echo Glenn and Nelson's statements too. I do have one quick comment on the offset hook, and I don't know if it's worth looking at, but it's -- I make this in all seriousness. My understanding is all the hooks are offset in the same direction.

My understanding also is there's a great

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

preponderance of the -- and I confuse the species here, but one of the turtle species -- the hooking is in the flipper. And the most -- and it's mostly hooked in the same flipper, and it may very well be that turtles are either right flippered or left flippered in a predominant manner, much as human beings are mostly right-handed versus left handed. And it might be worthwhile having one group of hooks offset in the other direction. And so you might take that into consideration.

Just one final comment, and it kind of goes to Glenn's last point, and that is while I'm extremely impressed with this program, and in particular the disentanglement and survivability once you get one of these animals hooked, I don't mean to rain on everybody's parade on these stunning results with respect to the reduction and interactions, but there is an alternate explanation.

The alternate explanation for these stunning results is that the baseline data adopted as gospel by the judge and put forward, you know, is severely flawed, which was the industries position to begin with that the data that resulted in the jeopardy finding was badly flawed from the get go.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So that is an alternate explanation in my mind, although I think at this point it's probably a moot point.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, do you want to speak to that point?

MR. DEVNEW: Sure. I was going to clarify that this study it wasn't the -- well, how do I explain this -- It didn't really account for the baseline of the turtle populations. The way this was run was the control set and the experimental set were fished at the same time. So the population levels of the turtles in the ocean aren't really a factor. It's more -- it's specifically isolating the impacts of the gear on the turtles. So, we're feeling that these reductions that we saw were because of these gear modifications.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, we'll take one more comment before we move on, Rick Weber.

MR. WEBER: The study itself, just trying to understand it. Were the multiple hooks, multiple baits used at the time or was it one set -- was the control set and then -- was it one gear type and one, bait type per set, or were the different things all placed into the water at the same time so you could

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

compare them in the same water at the same time?

Because I'm excited about circle hooks myself and I

like the direction that all of these stats are going.

But I find it -- if look at the same hook type, I find it miraculous that loggerheads dislike mackerel by 74 percent, leatherbacks dislike mackerel by 66 percent, and by changing to mackerel we increase swordfish catch by 64 percent. If it is only in the bait let's gives up the hooks and just discuss the bait. I'm encouraged with where we're going; something isn't ringing true for me and I just would like to understand it better.

MR. DEVNEW: The way the experiment was set up -- sorry, I didn't put up a slide; I didn't anticipate getting a question on that. I'll just run through sort of how we set up the sets. One type was -- the first half of the set was using squid in J-hooks, the second half of the set was using squid in the straight circle hooks. Another treatment type was the first half of the set; squid in J, the second half squid in offset circle, the third, was mackerel in J-hook. And then the second half of that set was mackerel in the offset circle hook. And then the fourth type was one half of the set was squid and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

then the other half was mackerel.

And I think he did it that way because when looking at bait types, he didn't want to alternate squid, and then mackerel by hook because there might be a chance that, you know, the skin of the mackerel being shiny it might reflect in the water more, you know, bringing turtles closer to that he felt it would be -- I don't know cleaner to look at it, just one half and then the other half. So --

SPEAKER: As I say guys, I would hope that these numbers are true. It just -- it wasn't -- they're so extreme, I would've expected up a couple of percent or down a couple of percent when we looked at bait type. And I -- just from a biologic standpoint I'm intrigued that the difference in feed is alone or -- well, I guess I answered it, in that the control was in the water at the same time. These must be closer to accurate than I was expecting.

SPEAKER: A lot has to do with the size of the animals that are being interacted with you know, and that you know, 2 1/8th width on the hook, you know, is relative to, you know, what one of those animals will take down, you know, in tanks, you know, what they'll attempt to swallow.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Tyson. What we would like to do now we have one half hour before lunch is -- one more comment.

SPEAKER: Just one of the things that we hope we're going to be able to do in the near future is not only to export this research to other parts of the world, but be able to export this research to other parts of our own fisheries in other coasts. There's a lot of progress that was made here, and we'd like to find out how well it works in the Pacific, as well.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks Jack. What we'd like to do very quickly is present the comments received on the incidental catch of bluefin Tuna by Longliners proposal that we recently had our for comment. We had four public hearings as well as the briefly present the comments received on the North Carolina petition for rulemaking. And that's a segue into bluefin tuna, which will take up then immediately after lunch.

Obviously, we have discussed this morning time/area closures and gear methods in fishing, or gear and fishing methods as a means of by-catch reduction. Certainly we are sensitive to the effect

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that regulations have in contributing to the dead discard problem. We've had comments throughout several years on managing the incident of catch a bluefin tuna by Longliners that the regulations themselves were contributing to excessive dead discards.

At last year's panel meeting we presented an approach, an analytical approach that the agency was undertaking to look at the problem and discern whether there could be any changes to the regulations that might alleviate some of the dead discard problem for the Longline fleet. So we won't belabor the methodology that was again presented at the public hearings. I saw several of you at the public hearings. But just wanted to briefly review the objective so that rulemaking; the third alternative that was proposed and put up for public comment and Brad will briefly summarize the comments received on that rulemaking. Thank you, Brad.

SPEAKER: Well, we're going to get to the permitting -- HMS permitting; we're going to cover that before lunch?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Not before lunch, but it is my hope that we get to it today.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. McHALE: Thank you, Chris. Mark Merry Brown, (phonetic), right now, is actually proceeding around the table; I believe he's handing out a copy of the summary of comments on the North Carolina petition. So if people had an opportunity to give that a read during lunch break, so when we reconvene afterwards, we can jump right into it. That I think would be in the best interests of time.

Like Chris had mentioned, I'm just going to give a very brief rundown of the proposed rule for the target catch unit for the long -- Pelagic Longline fleet, to retain incidentally caught bluefin tuna. Again, we're not going to belabor the analytical process, I'm just going to show the goals or the intent of altering this target catch requirement. I'll list out the preferred alternative and then I'll do a -- have a brief summary of the comments received and then we could take things from there. Just skip through this.

I think as we all know, kind of the intent of altering these target catch requirements based on ICCAT recommendations are to minimize dead discards.

We also are underneath the mandate to minimize the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

negative impacts on the target fishery, species and the participants in those fisheries. We're always trying to dance a fine line in between allowing the incidental retention of these bluefin tuna and preventing a directed fishery on them as well.

And whatever rules that we would need to put into place, need to be enforced effectively. We'd also received a number of comments from you all at last year's AP meeting. So, again we won't belabor that. And I just skipped through the analyses that was all done in the -- I can discuss this with anyone after the fact, but again in the interests of time, I'll keep it very brief.

The preferred alternative that the agency had come up with was to have one coast wide target catch requirement in getting away from a percentage of the target catch that's on board the vessel to equate out the bluefin tuna, and have a straight pounds limit. As you can see here at 2000 pounds for your first incidentally caught bluefin tuna to be retained and a second tier of 6000 pounds for your second bluefin tuna bend to be retained, and again this would be coast wide.

We also propose to maintain the north south

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

line, although adjusting a little further south to 31 degrees. We'd received comment back that maintaining this line would prevent the harvest of the incidental target catch in one area or another to provide equity, both -- in both geographical areas. One additional piece that the agency put forth in the proposed rule was to provide us with the authority for in-season adjustment.

Now that's going to be in-season adjustment on the number of bluefin tuna that can be retained by vessels, and as it was proposed, a range of zero to three bluefin tuna, would also have the ability to adjust those target catch requirements within 25 percent of that baseline trip. And we received some positive comment back on that as well. The justification for the preferred alternatives reflect back to those goals I'd mentioned earlier.

And a brief summary of the comments received on this proposed ruling -- keep in mind, this is some of the main things that we heard consistently throughout the meetings and by no means is this a summary of all the comments we've received. So if somebody provided a comment and I didn't list it here, I apologize and we can discuss that in a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

little while. But one of the main things that we heard was they're having a third tier to accommodate those trips that may be out at sea for longer durations of time and may interact with a few more bluefin tuna, and have larger amounts of target catch on board.

For instance, you know, currently, right now, a vessel with a 6000 pound target catch could make multiple trips in a month's time frame and come in with multiple bluefin tuna underneath that two-fish limit, or a vessel that's out there for 30-plus days, would still be capped at that two-fish limit. Again, the one thing that we heard at all the public hearings is that the quoted distribution that's distributed between the north and the south should be reexamined.

Currently in the proposed rule with the shift of the line to 31 degrees, the quota is split up in the -- 70 percent of that being allocated to the south, 30 percent to the north. Again, there was -- unanimous is the board for the north south line location adjustment to move that to a line where there is a minimal Longline activity. So there's no conflict in where these vessels are operating or

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

landing their fish.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the last comment that we received consistently was that, in conjunction with that inseason authority, the 30-day notification time wasn't realistic. It was too long to actually be reactive to what's taking place in the fishery and to get something in place in real time. And so that's the gist of this. I know it was very brief; and again I'll be available during the lunch break if anybody wants to go into anything in more detail. But I know a number of -- you attended the public hearings have already provided us comment, and I thank you on that.

Also in the back of the room I'll have -the slide presentation in its entirety, the
environmental assessment associated with this rule.
And we also do have a comment summary of all the
comments received during this proposed rule. So at
this point I like to just to turn it over for --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Probably take about five minutes of questions.

SPEAKER: Are we turning the whole fishery into an incidental fishery?

MR. McHALE: Well, currently Mel, (phonetic), right now, the retention of bluefin tuna

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on Pelagic Longline vessels is incidental, there is no directed fishery. So again, this is strictly for the Pelagic Longline vessels. SPEAKER: Well, isn't there a directed bluefin tuna fishery? MR. McHALE: There is with hand-gear, and there is with purse seine gear, but again, for bluefin tuna in the Pelagic Longline fishery, it is incidental. SPEAKER: Okay. MR. McHALE: It is no live target. SPEAKER: I thought that was -- incidental was only in the gulf where they spawn, that's not --MR. McHALE: No, it actually is coast wide. SPEAKER: All right. Would this interfere with the real objective of catching any bluefin tuna in the west, which is for scientific tracking? SPEAKER: Not sure what you mean by

"interfering with;" this is adjusting the regulations regarding what is allowed to be retained and landed -- wouldn't necessarily affect interaction rates, and if bluefin tuna is brought to the boat live, it can be tagged and released.

SPEAKER: Well, I mean, I don't if you all

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

considered it, but if the objective of catching tons that are allowed to be caught in a ease, and it was originally for scientific tracking, I suppose that looking at some, you know -- if you change regulations, you then change -- you put a bias in what the data means, which can interfere with the scientific tracking of the status of the stocks. And will making changes like this put that bias in that would upset the science. Was that considered?

SPEAKER: Okay. I understand your question much better now. The intent was and has been throughout the management period since the scientific monitoring quota was first initiated back in '81, was that we would maintain an allowance for Longliners to catch bluefin or to land bluefin taking incidental to the swordfish and yellowfin operations, whether it was in the Gulf of Mexico or not.

And the main thrust of all the regulatory adjustments throughout these -- this time frame, over the last 15 years has been to allow limited landings while avoiding an incentive to target. So to the extent that we're true to that management objective and have been consistently, this shouldn't affect fishing behavior significantly by adjusting these

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

target catch requirements.

What the analytical approach was, it -- we did present at last year's meeting, was we tried to scale it so that we reduce dead discards while allowed landings only within the authorized quota for that category. So it's a balancing objective that we conclude would not affect fishing behavior in such a way that it would upset any Longline index of abundance of bluefin tuna that had been developed and used in the stock assessment in years past.

SPEAKER: A comment, Mel, I know it's been a while maybe since you've been over there, but the scientific monitoring quota really ceased to exist in 1998, and started going south -- that we got it updated. Son of a gun, it's a real fisherman.

SPEAKER: It's science fiction.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Michael Leech.

MR. LEECH: Thank you, Chris. Just very quickly. I think you answered, Mo, (phonetic), but what this rule will do we'll take dead discards and convert them -- allow some of these boats to land one or two fish. So you're not changing anything as far as mortality goes, it's just that you're being able

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to land the fish rather than throw out over the rail.

And I just want to tell you, Chris, and all your people that worked on it, we really appreciate you all coming out with rulemaking on this issue. It's a serious issue for some of our boats in our region, and I think you all came up with some very good alternatives, so thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you. We submitted comments, and basically they were to the -- a fact that it's alarming that -- I know, I know -- I think it was 78 percent of the Longline catch was estimated to be in the previously defined southern region and now it's only 70 percent, although the southern region is smaller now under this proposed rule.

But to allocate 70 percent of the incidental catch to fish that could all be caught in the Gulf of Mexico, you know, the only known accepted spawning ground of these fish that, you know, have their lowest bio mass on record. I mean, I think that's very alarming and -- you know, I know most of the fish -- the -- all the fish caught in the Gulf of Mexico are incidentally caught, and if we just really urge to get that number down to, you know, as close to zero as possible, and to really get observers out

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on those boats. And I know that there haven't been in years past, and so we would just really again stress the importance of that, thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Jim Donofrio

MR. DONOFRIO: Yes, thanks. I just had a couple of questions, what -- do we know what the observer coverage is of boats that are in the Longline vessels in the Gulf of Mexico, is it broken down by any specific areas.

SPEAKER: I don't have those numbers with me but we can get them for you. Yes, obviously, we do have random assignment based on the home port of the vessel and the effort expended in the prior year, and we do a random draw so to speak with a stratified random design. So we can get the numbers of observers actually deployed on vessels of Gulf of Mexico for past years for you.

MR. DONOFRIO: Okay, yes, that would be great; I'd like to see that. My concerns are just similar to what Shana said. I think, you know, it's important that -- you know, we -- that we balance the ability to land, you know, fish that are already dead, you know, with the desire to, you know, stay

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

away from anything that might increase mortality especially with these fish that are in the Gulf of Mexico. And that's primarily where our concern is, in the Gulf of Mexico.

And again, you know, the fishing mortality of that stock is quite high, bio mass is quite low and, you know, we'd like to see fish that are already dead being landed, but we're just wary about doing anything that might, you know, increase mortality.

SPEAKER: Chris, thanks, I think we've been on record in the past when this program with the amount of fish on board in Longline vessel, the percentage of bluefin up to 3. We've been supportive of that, because it's, you know, it's wasteful for them to be just throwing these fish back, and it prevents a directed fishery, so -- I think all those measures are in place to prevent that.

What I want to urge though is, you know, more investigation onto, you know, where these bluefin are entering our waters. And I know this anecdotally from fishing many years with Ray, and his people up in the cape, it's around the first week in June the fish arrive and enter into the canyon areas; around the same time every year, it's like clockwork.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

where -- and I know some of the deckhands on Longline boats, said they had a lot of -- a lot of bluefin on their sets, that can be avoided by having a short time/area closure when the fish are there, because they don't stay there in that area, they move into the gulf or mainly to their feeding grounds. So you may want to look at other possibilities to avoid that kind of, you know, incidental catch, and only close it down shortly, and it doesn't hurt for the long term on both sides.

Now, a time and area closure in that area

SPEAKER: Thank you, Chris. I just want to repeat a couple of the comments that I made at the New Bedford public hearing, and that is that east coast tuna fully supports the preferred alternative to change it, and we appreciate that it's finally here, and long overdue.

I would say that it seemed as though from the analysis that Brad presented at the New Bedford hearing that the agency however was shooting a little bit low, and it wasn't clear that, you know, what you're planning on doing is trying to get them closer to full quota achievement, but testing the waters with the new limit. Because your own analysis suggested

you're only getting up to -- I forget what the number was -- 80 percent of the quota or 70 somewhat percent of the quota, and you do have some comments that suggests that particularly on the longer trips you might want to have even a more flexible bag on it.

And I don't -- and just as -- in the past we've opposed the arbitrary cap in the general category for the number --

(Tape interruption)

MR. BONFIL: -- definition of Essential Fish Habitat, some of the members of the panel have already expressed the fact that only the EEZ is taken into I think it's a valid point that should be resolved, as well as the entire distribution of the species, to put things in context. But more from the mentally, at least, from my point of view as a scientist, it worries me to see -- and maybe I'm not understanding the process of the agencies, or the division is going through when it comes to defining the Essential Fish Habitat, but just taking as an example, the maps that were put in the presentation there, it seems to me that we are trying to define the spawning, breeding, feeding and growth to maturity areas, simply as a presence-absence process, and from that point of view, I'm extremely worried.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I acknowledge that it is a very difficult undertaking, scientifically speaking, or technically speaking. How can we define if the presence or absence of a fish in a given point in time is meaningful in terms of whether it is spawning, or is it breeding, or is it mating, or is it -- what is it doing? We don't know. So, I don't know the details of the process you guys are going through, when you are doing these maps, but it's something that kind of puts a red light for me there. And I think it should be made a little bit clearer how you're going through to build these maps. Because if it is only the information that you are getting from catches or from the boats, or from the surveys, and just plotting that there and saying, okay this is Essential Fish Habitat just because we got a report that it was -- basically what we are doing is just plotting distribution of a species, and that doesn't equal Essential Fish Habitat.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, certainly it's a process of refinement as one gathers more information, and again, we acknowledged that sometimes your instruments of data collection are going to be limiting as well as a legal, one might call it an impediment, or at least an issue as to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

whether or not we can define the EFH beyond the EEZ, but we'll certainly take a look at that, and address it in the draft document, the extent to which we have information certainly beyond the presence-absence approach, looking at critical life stages, and what might be the, sort of, cause and effect of why the species is there in that life stage, and what is the importance of that particular habitat for that species, and as well as looking at any information we have available beyond the US EEZ. Shana, anything? Maybe a few more on this side, Jaime?

MR. ALVARADO-BREMER: I've got a question regarding, again, the chart of distribution of plotting adult data. And what I'm interested is, more than anything, is in the paucity of data, and why if the Miami Lab has generated since the 1990s a substantial amount of characterization of (inaudible) and for instance, Dennis Hou Lee (phonetic) and Fredia Rocha (phonetic) Polish paper with 14,000 females with gonadal indices were characterized, why are they —why is that data not plotted here? So, that's my first question.

SPEAKER: I would have to look into that. I would think that that data was incorporated. It may not. What you are saying here is a scale to reflect

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the number of observations for 100 nautical mile area. So, I would have to check into that.

MR. ALVARADO-BREMER: No, in particular I know for a fact, for example, under represented here is the Strait of Florida, the Strait of Yucatan, and the Sargasso Sea as the most important reproductive areas for Swordfish in what pertains the Swordfish fleet. In addition ICCAT has pretty much set forward certain criteria within the Swordfish workshop of how to define spawning grounds, and which would be very interesting with regard to how to define it in terms of Essential Fish Habitat for reproductive areas if it would incorporate not only larval distribution that are prone to dispersal by currents, but importantly gonadal indices together with sex ratios. In the case of Swordfish, we have seen that when you have an excess of males, generally coincides with the areas where the highest gonadal indices are found. Probably because females are not accessible to the fishery, but nevertheless, you can very much pinpoint and reduce your area of scope of distribution to find which are the areas that are -- could be more heavily impacted as Essential Fish Habitat for reproductive reasons.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Himie. We'll have to look into some of the ICCAT material, where you've identified the criteria for spawning areas. Jim Donofrio, Dewey Hemilright?

MR. DONOFRIO: Thank you, Chris. This is getting a little too complex here. I think both sides, commercial, recreational, I think we want to see sustainable re-built fisheries here. This whole EFH thing to me, when it first came out was just talking about Mars. I mean, I see things as a fisherman, keep a healthy forage base, predator-pray relationships, echo system managements, simplistic, I think we are missing that. I mean we're getting --we're getting down to so much layers of management here, we're never going to accomplish anything.

I agree with some of the comments here, I think Rich, you're right on the money, but then I hear Glenn, and, you know, be careful what you ask for. You know, be careful what you ask for here because, you know, we got ESA, okay, I understand what Haime's concerns are, you know, taking it outside the EEZ, but it would be really nice if we can enforce ESA on our partners in Europe, who are overfishing in great numbers. So, you know, we got to worry about what's here, and I guess we got to deal what's here, so I would say, let's try to keep it simple. Let's try to

keep it simple as fishermen, as, you know, biologists see it. Big fish eat little fish. Let's keep that relationship going first, and, you know, try to keep our mortality down whatever we can by adjustments, and how we catch fish, how we release fish, et cetera. But we're getting -- we're getting down to stuff here, we're never going to have ever, ever in our lifetimes resolve it, that's just my opinion, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, we have a few minutes; we want to take break at ten. So we had Dewey, Bob Fitzpatrick and then we will take a break.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: When I looked at the Essential Fish Habitat, and I noticed that the closure of North Carolina, the northern part of it, there is a small slither that was designated as Essential Fish Habitat. It's mainly north of Cape Hatteras lighthouse. But yet, you close down a great deal of area. You go from the shore where it was Essential Fish Habitat, you went straight out to 50 fathoms and you go down where there is no interaction, there has been no observed -- observance of fish takes.

When I see this Essential Fish Habitat, does that mean that that -- that habitat's essential in January, February and March, because if you went there

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and did a study, at that time, there wouldn't be no fish there. So, are we just getting this Essential Fish Habitat label when somebody goes there, and does the studying when the fish is passing through, or does that mean that that fish is there a year round, because it's not there a year round. It's got a tail, and it's going to swim. I mean if it held it there, heck, you would be fishing there maybe, but it's not going there.

I think it's kind of like we put this well, let's have a Essential Fish Habitat, and we -- well, that would be -- that's another plus, we include that in the closure, we can say that it's Essential Fish Habitat, but the fish aren't there. The times that you, I mean you look at your study, was the study for Essential Fish Habitat in this one particular area? Was it done in May, June, July? Or was it done in January, February or March? Because it's almost like you're, you know, let's just use -- say it's Essential Fish Habitat, and it gets us off the hook, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Bob Fitzpatrick?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes, I just wanted -- I can ditto on Rich's stress of the importance of forage, and I assume that the Essential Fish Habitat

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

will become more important as we go more towards echo system based management, and this sort of is toddler right now, but we have before our very eyes in New England, and the comment about, we don't seem -- appear to have any fishing interaction that's causing a problem -- or those weren't your words -- but basically it didn't appear to be a problem with different gear types right now.

However, right before our very eyes, in New England, we have what we consider a serious problem. And if -- when you look at the regulatory requirements on page 182, it talks about habitat related -- habitat related densities, and or relative abundances, right, in the law. Additionally, it says this information should be interpreted with a risk averse approach, a.k.a., the precautionary approach, which is what we have been saying is completely lacking in the herring fishery in New England. And, the last two years when the fish came, and basically completely left, we weren't -- didn't start squealing two year ago. were talking about this in '96, '97, '98, '99, we've been telling you for almost a decade that we are going to have train wreck. That it's coming, we've seen it coming, we've seen specifically, and we could put data together for you. I don't know what we got to do to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

get forage as particularly for Bluefin, in the Gulf of Maine into this game, and get it to have some level of importance, but we've seen condition factor a.k.a., how much fat Bluefin have in New England starting in '96, and '97, basically head south. In other words, fish that would typically get fat, in a certain period of time. Once things get right and the echo system is set up, and you have all the life, you've got the herring and the whales, and everything else, we get what we call rubber balls at first, but over a period of time, the fish improve.

Well, starting in '96, and '97 we saw less and less improvement, and we started saying that there is a problem. The problem has now progressed to the point were the fish have come, and have left, wholesale departure to Canadian waters.

Now, you can pick the thing apart and try to micro analyze it, but there is something called herring that is sort of the easy answer, and we've got scientific advise that is being basically caution to the wind, regarding the tack in area 1A, and what the scientific advise says should be getting caught, especially in light of numerous years of overfishing in 1A that the data is now available, when are we going to -- you know, we got -- we see it happening.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

It's right in front of us. Are we going to wait a year, two years? How long do we have to wait until something occurs that, you know, where the light bulbs are going to light up, and we are going to see some management decisions, or at least some influence, because I know it's the New England council, but you guys can certainly try and influence the process. Help us.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Certainly a very valid point, and I think what you've -throughout and -- in the initial concept is the echo system approach, may have more bearing on it than EFH. Obviously, if the Bluefin are there only because herring are there, you might say it's not necessarily a habitat issue. They are finding habitat essential for their survival, and growth in Canadian waters because the herring are there. So, the question is, is it a presence or absence of herring that defines it as essential for the Bluefin Tuna to be in the Gulf of Maine. I think that it is more appropriately analyzed and addressed through an echo system approach to management that strictly EFH alone. Certainly, there is a -- there is an intersection, and we will seek to establish a better working relationships as the -with the councils in that regard as the agency comes

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to grips with how to manage on an echo systems basis. So, with that we will take a break here. And, within 15 or 20 minutes please get back to your seats, so we can get on with time/area closures.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right folks, let's please get started. We are going to move into our discussion of time/area closures. A very key feature of a rule making that we completed subsequent to the completion of the highly migratory species and billfish plans in '99. For those who were involved in the process, and many of you were, during the development of the FMP we had some time/area closures

(Tape interruption)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: -- The Florida Straits identified, what we elected to do was pull back, I guess you could say in a sense in the actual FMP, documents from that proposed closure because of the overwhelming comment that we needed a more comprehensive approach to by-catch reduction including the use of time/area closures, and we elected to do that via a subsequent regulatory amendment which was completed after the FMP in August of 2000. So, that implemented some additional closed

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The closed areas, I think, will have an areas. overview slide of all the existing closed areas, but one of the ongoing concerns that has been addressed to some extent at the subsequent panel meetings we have since that rule making was completed was how effective had those closed areas been, and whether or not additional closed areas are warranted or even if some of the boundaries of those closed areas can be modified to achieve the same goals or ends of by-catch reduction while relaxing some of the constraints on the commercial and or recreational fleets. So, with that Chris Rilling who is on point again for a presentation on the closed areas, and how they might be modified during this plan consolidation process.

MR. RILLING: Just to give you a brief overview, I'll expand a little bit on what Chris just said. Obviously our time/area closures are designed to reduce by-catch, protected species, as well as non-target HMS. There've been several time/area closures implemented in recent years, and what we plan to do is take a comprehensive look at all of those time/area closures and see whether the goals and objectives of those closures are being met. And of course, we're proposing several additional new alternatives to address ongoing by-catch issues. So, the alternatives

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

listed here. Within each one of are these alternatives, there could be sub-alternatives. for instance, well, let me go through them here. Alternative Number 1, the no action alternative would simply maintain the existing time/area closures with no new time/area closures implemented. The second alternative would be to implement time/area closures looking at all gears, not just pelagic long line gears, for White Marlin, and important habitat areas. The third alternative -- and for instance within that alternative 2, there may be several sub-alternatives looking at specific areas. For Alternative Number 3 we would consider time/area closures for small tooth Swordfish to include all gears as well. Alternative Number 4 would be based upon the analysis of Alternative Number 1 or our comprehensive view of all of the data on existing time/area closures we may propose to make modifications to existing time/area So, that could include refinement of an It could include expansion of an area, area. cetera.

And then the fifth would be to implement complementary HMS management measures in the Madison-Swanson and Steam Boats Lumps Marines Reserves. I'll go through each of those alternatives in little more

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

detail. Here are existing closures ranging from the North East distant closure to reduce the by-catch of Sea Turtles loggerhead and leatherback, primarily North Eastern US closures to reduce Bluefin Tuna discards and mid Atlantic closure moving down the coast to reduce sandbar, juvenile sandbar, and dusky shark by-catch. The Charleston Bump Florida East Coast, and the DeSoto Canyon closures were implemented to reduce billfish as well as juvenile Swordfish, and other HMS discards and by-catch.

You can see in the inside map on the upper left hand corner the NED in comparison to the rest of the Atlantic, and one interesting point to note is that the overall area encompassed by all the time/area closures is approximately 2.7 million square miles. By comparison the landmass of the United States is approximately 3.4 million square miles.

For the first alternative, the no-action alternative, to maintain the existing time/area closures with no new time/area closures implemented, a few pros and cons of that alternative, obviously the ecological benefit of those closures has been to reduce the by-catch protected species, and target and non-target HMS. However, as always new areas may be needed to further reduce by-catch, particularly for

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

some of the marlin species and Sea Turtles. And I don't think I need to point this out, but obviously the existing closures may have had an economic burden and continue -- would continue to have an economic burden if they are left in place as they currently exist.

The second alternative would be to analyze time/area closures for all gear types for White Marlin in important habitat areas. White Marlin are overfished, and frequently you see that written in documents as severely overfished. And, overfishing is continuing, and time/area closures may be needed to further reduce by-catch. This would obviously decrease by-catch overfished marlin as well as other HMS depending on the areas that we selected, and that is one of the things that we are looking at is not just single species interactions, but trying to get the most bang for the buck and seeing if there aren't multiple species interactions in a given area. those could include Sea Turtles as well.

Obviously any additional new time/area closures would potentially impose economic burdens on fishermen and related businesses. In terms of the looking at the White Marlin potential time/area closures, we have plotted some data from the pelagic

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

observer program which you see here in gray; 1310 sets

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

observed from 2001 through 2003, and then overlaid with the black points of the White Marlin interactions which totaled 418 for that three year period.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: What was that number?

MR. RILLING: 418. This is from the pelagic observer program data.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That's live and dead, as well.

MR. RILLING: That's correct; Live and dead. Moving on to the pelagic long line logbook data, plotted all of the sets for three years from 2001 through 2003, total number of sets reported was 31,388 with 3,155 marlin white interactions, plotted in black. So, we'd be looking at this information as well as any additional information as Bob alluded too earlier in his question to me about the Essential Fish Habitat information. That is one of the key pieces of information that we would be looking at in addition to where the highest observed by-catch and discards for White Marlin may be. In addition obviously we would be looking at Sea Turtles interaction and other HMS discards or juvenile undersized HMS.

The third alternative would be to look at

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

time/area closures for small tooth Sawfish. Pristis pectinada was listed April 1st, 2003, as an endangered species under ESA, has been extirpated in much of its range and is now only found in localized areas, primarily in Florida. This alternative would decrease the by-catch of endangered Sawfish and is important to point out that Sawfish interactions with most HMS gears are very low, but could nonetheless result in economic burden on fisherman if the time/area closure were implemented.

Here you see the historical locations of Sawfish interactions; this was gathered by the Sawfish review committee, and you will notice that Sawfish really have been extirpated from lot of these areas and are primarily found in Florida at this point. So that is obviously part of the concern and was one of the driving mechanisms behind the listing document.

Here you see the observed small tooth Sawfish interactions in the shark bottom Longline fishery. We have had eight interactions since observers began reporting information in this fishery. Of those seven were at least alive. Only one was released dead. And here you can see the total number of sets which were observed throughout that time period, and which those small tooth Sawfish were

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

observed. So it would seem be fairly localized down in the Florida Keys, and the Dry Tortugas with the highest number of interactions occurring down there. I believe it's six out of the total eight. So that would likely be one of the areas that we would be examining for a potential time/area closure.

Alternative 4, to make modifications to existing closures. As I mentioned at the outset, this would be dependent upon our analysis. And to get a overview of at least some preliminary information on analyzing pelagic Longline log book data to document any changes and effort and by-catch and discards from the period preceding implementation of most of the time/area closures versus post-implementation of the time/area closures, you could look on page 336 of the pre-draft. And at least our preliminary look at the data from the logbook indicates that the time/area closures have had the desired effect of reducing bycatch and discards of a lot of the non-target HMS, or undersized Swordfish, discards of billfish as well as sailfish, and spearfish. And in fact some of the preliminary information indicates that Bluefin Tuna, Bigeyed Tuna, and Swordfish discards have all declined by greater than 30 percent. Blue Marlin and White Marlin discards have declined by approximately 50

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

percent, and Sea Turtles discards have declined by approximately 28 percent.

Obviously there are some additional analysis that needs to go into this; this is simply the reported data. We also need to look into the observer program data and any additional information we might have. What we are hoping to do with this alternative is to perhaps target some of the areas of highest interactions that continue to exist perhaps refine some of the existing time/area closures, and thereby also providing access to some of the areas in which we have -- we will be able to document hopefully that undersized Swordfish or other billfish by-catch and discards has declined, or is no longer as great an issue.

Obviously the benefits to maintaining or making modifications that further target the areas of highest interactions would be to reduce the by-catch, continue to make strides in reducing billfish, and Sea Turtle by-catch and discards. Obviously any expansion of areas that might result could have an economic burden, but we are hoping that by taking this comprehensive look and seeing where the highest interactions are occurring that we might be able to refine some of these areas as well.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

implement

complimentary HMS management measures and the Madison-Swanson and Steam Boats Lumps Marines Reserves would be designed to provide consistency between the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council closure areas for gag grouper. What you see here is the two small boxes. They encompass approximately 214 nautical --square nautical miles. You see them in relation here to the DeSoto Canyon closure area. Apparently the Gulf of Mexico regulations prohibit all fishing from November through April, and trawling from May through November. And the intent of this alternative would be to implement similar closures for HMS gears in those areas.

final

alternative

to

The

We've been taking a preliminary look at some of the data that we do have from the pelagic Longline log book data, which you see plotted in gray here with perhaps just a few points falling within the Madison-Swanson areas. Looking at the observer, pelagic observer program data, the dark points, again no observed sets within those areas, and finally looking at the shark bottom Longline observed sets in the Gulf of Mexico, we do see one set that fell within the Madison Swanson closure area.

So again, we would be looking at all the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

gears that are currently being fished in those areas, and doing an analysis of the potential impacts of closures to make them consistent with the Gulf of Mexico regulations. And that concludes my presentation.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Just to reiterate the area closures currently in place have been established to address many and varied by-catch issues within the HMS fisheries, whether it is Bluefin Tuna turtles, White Marlin juvenile Swordfish, and obviously we've heard this morning with respect to our EFA discussion trying to pay some attention to small tooth Swordfish. we have a lot of feedback from industry regarding the cumulative impact of these closures. Often we will do, we are required to do each time we do a rule making with the closure is to analyze the cost and benefits of each one. Increasingly we need to analyze the cumulative impacts of these additional closures as they arise. And I've gotten some comment over the years that perhaps the area closures are broader or more extensive in time than they need to be to address the by-catch issues of particular concern for which they were implemented.

So, basically at this juncture we've seen

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

21

22

23

24

25

the whole gamut of closures is on the table for review, and additional analysis, how productive have been and at what cost, and whether any refinements to them in time or aerial extent can be done to ease the cumulative economic burden on industry while at the same time continuing to address the by-catch problems that have occurred. So, with that we look forward to some interesting discussion --

SPEAKER: Process --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Process on this discussion or on the plan amendment?

SPEAKER: No.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: On this discussion, okay.

SPEAKER: Do you want comments on the North Carolina petition at this time, or will that be a separate discussion.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That is a separate discussion. North Carolina has submitted a petition for rule making to modify the mid Atlantic closed area for shark. And, that is predominantly of North Carolina and Louis Daniel is prepared to make a presentation on that. We have that later on in the Agenda.

But certainly the existing closed area is an

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

issue. Perhaps we -- I don't want to use the word avoid -- but could benefit from Louis's presentation before we delve into the details of that closed area and any modification. But all the other closed areas are certainly open for discussion during this session.

So I think we started counter clockwise last time, so we'll go clock wise this time. Shana?

MS. MILLER: I think it is great that White Marlin closures are not closures, but White Marlin are on the table to at least look at when analyzing time/area closures, and I think it is important also look at Bluefin Tuna which are obviously at similarly low levels. And for Bluefin, you know, it is not just juvenile Tuna that should be looked at. Certainly, the mature Tuna spawning in the Gulf of Mexico have really been impacted by the pelagic Longline fleet down there, and if you look at the -- the pelagic Longline sets for White Marlin, it also there is a overlap with Bluefin Tuna. So that could be an opportunity to, you know, kill, or save two birds with one stone. And, for the existing closures, if they have been proven to be effective, I think, it would be premature to reopen those if, you know, it may negate some of the benefits that have been achieved to this point, thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, Shana. But because we're all also concerned about seabird by-catch we won't say we will kill two birds with one stone in this -- in this discussion, Well, Jack -- Jack Devnew.

MR. DEVNEW: Yes, I don't know if we'll have an opportunity to go back around or anything. not sure how well I got my thoughts together, at the moment actually, but just a couple of, I guess, quick things. I did want to reiterate and make sure it's in the document actually, so I didn't really see it in the presentation here. My recollection, back in '99, when this was done, was the primary impetus to the closed areas was in fact the juvenile Swordfish catch in the Straits of Florida, primarily. Okay, that I would consider not a by-catch issue at all. is, is a regulatory discard. And it had, you know, and I think it is important to -- the detail in the language, I think it is very important. Not so much at this table necessarily, but in any kind of written documents, and their use in the public at large.

You know, George Orwell, in 1984 coined a phrase newspeak and we have that going on in fisheries these days. And, a couple of things spring to mind: one is the use of the term overfishing. It is the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

only legal term we can describe any condition where the fishery resource is not available, you know, up to and you know why. Okay so, it doesn't matter what the cause is the actual term technically is overfishing. That's huge in the minds of people out in, you know, the heartland of America that don't know much detail about it. Regulatory discards have, you know, become by-catch here, so I think it's, you know, I think it is important to note that in the document that the primary impetus was for juvenile Swordfish.

I think given that fact and given the fact of the great success and the recovery of Swordfish, the one alternative I don't see here in terms of actually delineated would be to reopen closed areas. And I think that should be the preferred alternative, at least with the respect to Swordfish as a species. The reopening of closed areas, and management of closed areas -- management, there is a lot There has been in the State of precedent for it. Maine, and as in the Gulf of Maine, a long history of ruling time/area closures to protect spawning herring. Okay, so it starts down east, we have a closure, then it moves to mid coast Maine, by the time moves to Southern Maine, you have a reopening of the initial closed area behind the down east, and so on and so

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

forth. And than when the spawning is done it's either the areas reopen in its totality. We spoke earlier about scallop closed areas. Actually, now more than half of the fishery is compelled to take place in the closed areas. They found so much success in that resource. In fact what they found was actually mountains, and I'm sure John, in his discussions with his colleagues, you know, down at (inaudible), you know, what they found was mountains of clappers, empty shells. They died of old age, is what they did in the scallop resource in some of these closed areas. so the compulsure(sic) was actually compelled to get back in there and open them back up. So I think it is a fluid situation, you know, when you come to time/area closures, and management through time/area closures, and it is -- I think it can be, if used properly, a very effective tool in the conservation of resources, and then the wise utilization of them.

So I would like to actually see another alternative put in there, well, you know, especially on a species by species basis. With respect to any type of closed area targeting White Marlin, I would caution against it. And the reason is it is a diminimus impact. One of the things that came clear in the discussion when their petition was made a few

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

years ago -- I think it was three years ago now -- to list it as a -- to get a listing for White Marlin, one of the things that was eminently clear is that the United States -- and I'm going to quote some kind of figure that probably not going to be very exact -- but it was somewhere -- the United States as a source of mortality on the White Marlin stock was somewhere like four to six percent, you know, of the entire mortality.

So we are now contemplating some incremental action that even if we somehow did something to eliminate all mortality of U.S. source on White Marlin would at best address five percent of the total mortality which in and of itself is not going to do much. So to then sit here and create a structure where you are going to shut areas of the ocean of to just get part of that -- what are you going to get, one percent? It's -- it's just -- it's not worth, it's not a wise use of resources, it's not a wise economic sacrifice for anybody. So, I would certainly caution against that. Ad those would be the only two time/area closure that I would care to speak to at the moment, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Glenn Delaney?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. DELANEY: Thank you, Chris. First of all, I am glad Chris that you did note after the presentation that revisions to existing time/area enclosures, not just the no-action or expansion options are on the table. I mean we are basically rethinking and re-looking at time/area closures and I appreciate that clarification. As Jack noted, the basis for many of those time/area closures in the Gulf and South Atlantic region was concern for the Swordfish, the status of the Swordfish stock and juvenile mortality. And we have seen, I think, a -just a dramatic change in the circumstances since those time/area closures went in specifically with regard to Swordfish but also just generally in terms of our understanding of by-catch, in the Longline fisheries.

There's been an enormous amount of research as we all know with tremendous results. Our ability to evaluate by-catch data on a more refined scale has increased, I think, dramatically. I think, our ability to enforce very effectively the lines drawn through the BMS technology has increased dramatically and BMS enforcement is wide spread through many commercial fisheries now, and found to be very precise and useful and practicable by both the industry and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the agency.

And I say that was some trepidations because I certainly still have plenty of clients who don't like BMS, but the reality is it does work for both of us in many ways. It's not a popular thing everywhere but it's getting there. We've gone to a 100 percent circle hooks in these fisheries with a number of other gear and bait, and handling improvements. As I said, there's just a tremendous increase in the understanding and awareness and focus on by-catch reduction, and how to reduce the mortality of by-catch in Longline fisheries.

We have probably have better observer coverage and that I think improves our understanding of what's going on. Not to mention the Swordfish stock itself has gone fro -- oh, in 1999 what we were at, maybe 65, 58 percent of BMSY, we're at or near 100 percent of that, maybe we even bumped up above it. Another huge thing that has changed since then is that the U.S. has dramatically reduced its ability to harvest it's ICCAT quota. The ICCAT quota has changed somewhat, but our ability to harvest has basically gone into freefall since the 2000 closures went into effect.

We've gone to essentially harvesting our

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

quota and if you look at the landing statistics you'll see that it's fallen dramatically each year since then, since the closures went into effect. And perhaps this year we will not harvest between 30 and 40, probably closer to 40 percent of the U.S. Swordfish quota given to us by ICCAT.

As many of you know, I've been crying wolf over ICCAT taking away unused U.S. quotas, whether it's Swordfish or anything else. I don't think I'm crying wolf this time. I think in 2006 we're going to be faced with the new staff(?) assessment, which will trigger a re-allocation debate within ICCAT of north Atlantic Swordfish quotas, which the U.S. will be unable to sustain. I mean we will have after this series of years of demonstrated inability and aggressively reduced ability to harvest our quota, I think we will -- it will be impossible for the U.S. Delegation and the Commissioners to thwart efforts to have our quota re-allocated to other nations.

And as many of you have recognized and I appreciate that recognition, no other nation takes care of their by-catch species, whether it's turtles, White Marlin or small Swordfish, than U.S. does in its pelagic on line fisheries. And, no one manages their fisheries to the extent that we do. So any quota that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

leaves our plate and goes on to somebody else's, is a negative conservation or mortality impact on those bycatch situations as well as probably for Swordfish as well

I think what the point is, is that clearly we are in a position, there is a great deal of rationale and impetus for a complete re-evaluation of these areas in terms of Swordfish by-catch as well as all by-catch, and that we need to sharpen our focus, increase the resolution, when these lines were drawn in that process in 1999-2000, it was a fair -- these lines were drawn fairy aggressively. And, there were limited abilities to refine those areas based on the data and the enforcement tools available to you. think we are in a position now, of such a greater level of understanding and having improved tools at our finger tips that we can start to look for ways to achieve the objectives, the by-catch objectives of these areas, while as the Magnuson Act asked us to do, minimize adverse economic impacts on the fisheries that are not justified by the cost and benefit of bycatch reduction.

And so I think that this exercise provides us an opportunity to do that. There may be revisions to the time/area closures that can increase our by-

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

catch reduction abilities as well as to reduce the adverse economic impacts on the fishery that it is not justified by looking at, you know, some discrete revisions to the existing areas. I'm looking at my notes to see if I left anything out. I'm sure I've rambled on but that's the -- that's sort of the premise we want you to have that as an option available to all those areas. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Nelson?

MR. BEIDEMAN: Again as Glenn has said, a lot has changed since 1999-2000, when this was all under development. Back then, it was very difficult to look at anything less than like a 2 by 2 area. Because enforcement wanted a large area and some of the data would only, you know, wasn't revived. Today, we've got better data. We've got BMS enforcement. I think that's an important factor.

Today, we have a 100 percent circle hooks and careful handling release. Where we had an active fleet of 160, 180 vessels, when this was being developed, we've got a fleet of 105 active of vessels.

Also, it's, you know, it's critical what Glenn pointed out. We have approximately a 3900 metric ton, country specific Swordfish quota that we're using only

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

approximately 2400 metric tones of. And, we've gone into ICCAT with promises, well, we we're working on this ESA stuff and we've got research going and you know, we've been manipulated our Swordfish fleet. Well, promises and words aren't going to work at the re-allocation in 2006.

Bottom line is, if the United States doesn't show, demonstrate to the other ICCAT nations that it's taken steps to fully utilize its ICCAT quota, we're not going to have it after the, you know, next reallocation, that's bottom line in ICCAT. We will be proposing adjustments. We look forward t.o adjustments. A fully rebuilt Swordfish stocks still needs protections. We still believe in protecting the juvenile Swordfish, but certainly not the severe restrictions that were put in place for a rebuilding. Basically, what we are looking at is adjusting the offshore boarders of several of the existing all time/area closures.

It's always been our contention that the primary by-catch problem is the inshore shallow depth areas and the offshore deeper depth areas can be more cleanly fished, less by-catch and a viable fishery. And also maintaining the inshore areas keeps a buffer for reducing gear conflict between the recreational

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and commercial fisheries. I don't know that it's necessary to get into the June closure but we suggest that the June of Bluefin Tuna closure be re-evaluated in light of the 100 percent circle hooks, careful handling release and the new catch criteria, which has only been in place for a short time and needs a little bit of time to see what it's effect on the fishery will be.

The big question, you know, comes down to whether or not the U.S. is going to actually take steps to re-invigorate its Swordfish fishery to fully utilize the quota. And that's, you know, that's something that I think everybody should take a very serious look at because we will loose, as far as, you know, time/area closures and evaluating the existing or evaluating any additional, you need to look at all gears.

We all know that hook and line fishing has post-release mortality. It can't be ignored. In some cases it may be very substantial. It cannot be ignored. All gears do need to be looked at. And also a, you know, its - there's a very - you know, very considerable safety factors involved in the time/area closures. When you're forcing small boats to go hundreds of miles further offshore, there is a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

safety considerations, and anyone that fishes on highly migratory species knows that they tend to congregate on various features. So, you know, just going 50 miles in any one direction may not put you on highly migratory species unless it's a bottom contour that creates uplifting or an edge of water you know, consistent edge such as the Gulf Stream.

When you close off one area, it may be several hundred miles before you can go to another viable fishing feature. So, safety is a big concern. Basically on behalf of, you know, the fishery that has pretty much led the way on re-building Swordfish and is currently leading the way on by-catch friendlier, you know, circle hooks and careful handling release, we look forward to reasonable adjustments that would allow a viable U.S. fishery while still protecting, you know, by-catch. And, we think that can be done.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Nelson. Gail Johnson.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. First of all, the reduction in by-catch is laudable and it has not only to do with the closed areas but also something to do with a number of boats that are now fishing, because that's quite reduced. The evaluation of the closed

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

areas, I almost think that you need to evaluate the changes in catch and mortality of that, of the by-catch, when we were using circle hooks because that's a fundamental change.

And I think that's the horse that comes, at least slightly before the cart, of the areas. And, in evaluating these areas of particular interest is, as Nelson said, the outside of the east coast of Florida, any place that the smaller boats have to go or that were relatively not well defined when we put them in place in the first place. Also, the Bluefin closed area.

One of the things that, over the years has stuck in my mind and I haven't seen it -- I haven't read the whole document, but I haven't seen that practicability word in there. And in the objectives I didn't specifically see -- I saw a lot of about rebuilding, restoring, conservation and in -- for Billfish I saw, you know, maintaining the highest availability and vibrant -- not these words but the idea of a vibrant recreational fishery.

And as Jack had said, I think perhaps one of the objectives that needs to be in there, and the closed areas are relevant to it, is to keep a viable or maybe vibrant Longline fishery for food production.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And, also for our ability to keep on being able to affect negotiations and actual transference of these kinds of technologies to avoid Sea Turtles and White Marlin and using the circle hooks.

Is it ultimately practicable for the United States to make more closed areas? Because it's not clear to me as you were going through them. To my admittedly uneasy -- where I sit here, I'm looking at, oops are they going to make more of them? So, keep it in mind and I know you do, how much is actually practicable considering where we are in the total Atlantic catch and how the best way that the United States can effect conservation in the Atlantic through the ICCAT arena. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Gail. Ken Hinman?

MR. HINMAN: Thank you, Chris. Now, for something completely different. In going over the effectiveness of the existing closures and your analyses of that, it was mostly quantitative in terms of the numbers, percent reductions from pre-closure days and maybe measuring them against what was projected to be effective to closures but didn't really hear up a qualitative judgment from NIMPS on the effectiveness of the closures, but I would assume

that you probably would agree that they have been very effective in reducing the by-catch and discards of the whole range of species.

Overall, I guess it's more then 30 percent reduction in by-catch, for some species, Billfish in particular it's over 50 percent. I think, I would argue that these closures have not only been effective in the past but are effective now and are needed in the future. Most of these species, billfishes in particular, are still overfished Bluefin Tuna are still overfished and a number of the sharks are still overfished.

It's been pointed out that protecting juvenile Swordfish was the main impetus for the choice of the southern Longline closures, and that's true. But I would disagree very strongly that we are now in a position where those closures are not needed anymore or that they are not providing, or will not in the future provide, benefit to the Swordfish population and I think even the Swordfish fishery.

We don't know what the 2006 Swordfish assessment is going to say. So we really can't speculate. Hopefully it will show even more improvement than we saw in the 2002 assessment. But in the 2002 assessment the biomass, that was talked

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

about of being near rebuilt to the MSY level, was primarily juvenile fish, 75 percent of them were fish that had never spawned.

And, we need to continue to protect young Swordfish, not just under the minimum size but young Swordfish in general, because we need to rebuild this population to a large adult population that will sustain a fishery for the future. I think the best way to increase our catch of our ICCAT quota is to continue to rebuild the Swordfish population where we have a large -- a larger population of large Swordfish.

Overfishing of sword fish occurred because the Longline fleet moved southward from a traditionally New England Fishery, which meant catching a lot of -- lot more juvenile sword fish. And I think to reopen these Swordfish area -- closed areas to Swordfishing in order to rebuild or to take our ICCAT quota, I think will have the effect of retarding that Swordfish rebuilding. Actually, probably, possibly just sort of freezing that recovery where it is now. Never seeing the return of the New England Fishery, return of the New England hand gear, conventional hand gear fisheries.

And, I think it would also be trading that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

for a large increase, which has been really a bonus of these closures in reduction of by-catch of a lot of billfish and sharks. So. I would argue that we not only -- we need to keep these closures in effect. don't have a problem with modifying their boundaries, if we can show that it's at least conservation neutral. If there are ways to draw those lines and achieve the same kinds of results and actually allow more, you know, more directive fishing for other species, I don't really have a problem with that. As long as it is least conservation neutral but I would argue that we probably need to look at modifying them in some ways to protect both White Marlin as Shana pointed out and Bluefin Tuna. I don't know what those are, I think some areas have been identified in the mid Atlantic on the outer edge of the Florida east coast closure in the Western Gulf. You know, you need to do some of those analyses to see really what we could get out of some of those closures and what effect they would have on the Longline fishery as well.

The other thing I want to point out is that there's been a 15 percent reduction in effort in the Longline fishery during the period you're measuring the effectiveness of these closures, and so I would

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

like to see some kind of projections on, you know, if that -- if there were to be a 15 percent increase in Longline effort in the fishery, what would that do to those numbers that we have there? You know, would it erase a lot of that conservation benefit we've seen. So, I think we really need to take a look at that before we start reopening some of these areas.

On Sawfish, I think this is obviously a desperately endangered animal and I think to the extent we can look at something that can be done in South Florida to help them, we should. It looked like the numbers of interactions in the HMS fisheries were very small down there. And I wonder -- I didn't hear much about what other kinds of fisheries are interacting inshore fisheries, whether there is -- I know most of the net fisheries are not operating in Florida, but are there other fisheries that are interacting with these things? But I think this panel and this FMP should, if it's not proposing closures on the HMS gears, it should be recommending what kind of gears really need to be taken out of those areas to protect Sawfish which is something that comes under the -- our jurisdiction.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Ken. Rich Ruais?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RUAIS: Yes, yes.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes that -you look under that mike, it'll have your name on it,
bottom of it.

MR. RUAIS: Thank you, I'm sure that coming after Jack, Jaime, Glenn, Gail, there's nothing original that I can say at this point. But I did want to say that I was impressed with Chris' presentation where he documents double-digit reductions in bycatch, 30 percent, 50 percent, 28 percent. To me that's a, you know, a demonstrable fact that you have an incredible cooperative conservation effort by the Longline fishery and at some point in time, it's -there has to be some reward for that type of conservation. I think clearly closures totaling three quarters the size of the continental United States, in light of these reductions, in light of the progress of the Swordfish recovery, it's excessive, and I simply hope that NMFS will work with the industry.

Contrary to Ken, I didn't hear any of the prior speakers talking about eliminating closed areas.

I heard refining, work with us to look for the areas where we can have a balance between an economically viable and growing Swordfish industry and recovering billfish and Swordfish stocks. The only other point

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'd make is to back up what Glenn said. I mean, we see this at ICCAT all the time. If you want a voice, if you want influence in the conservation efforts, you've got to have quota share. If you lose quota share, you lose your voice and you lose influence. Thanks.

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR} \mbox{ \begin{tabular}{ll} \parbox{CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:} & \parbox{Thank you.} \\ \parbox{Will Gerencer.} & \parbox{CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:} & \parbox{Thank you.} \\ \parbox{Rogers:} & \p$

MR. GERENCER: Thanks. I'm a big fan of closed area management, in spite of the economic hardship that it places on a large part of the industry. I'm also a ground fish advisor in New England and we carry 8,300 square miles of year round closures up there, which is roughly the size of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, then another 30,000 miles of rolling enclosures that —seasonal closures, which you could add up roughly the size of the State of Maine, and by scale that's a lot of our fishing bottom. At one time or another it was closed.

And we have allowed access, harvesting access back into the closed areas because they had been so successful on at least three species; scallops, haddock, and yellowtail flounder. And it's not done willy-nilly. I mean, we don't say, "Okay,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we've been successful now. We're going to open them up again." And one of the reasons for scallop access was, there were a lot of scallops in there. But also there is a conservation benefit you can realize because the scallop boats weren't fishing nearly as long for as many scallops. In other words, the drags weren't impacting the bottom. They might have the drag on the bottom for two or three hours for an entire trip as opposed to, you know, several days for a trip. Because they're catching so much and they are spending most of their time shucking the scallops.

So my point is that access to harvesting closed areas needs to be done -- and I agree with it - needs to be done with some forethought. I mean, we're training our skippers now how to interact with turtles, and we're looking at other kinds of by-catch workshops which may well be mandatory, and if we've got a fishing fleet that has participants that are this well-trained, then there is a case to be made for, you know, can we train them and can we learn how to go into some place and not interact with smaller Swordfish. And if those kinds of things that -- can be done, then that's the way I think we should approach it.

You know, in addition, we're -- we have the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

VMS component now on the boat. So it makes that kind of management a lot easier, you know. The goal of the closed area is to rebuild the stock. And at some point we need to think about rebuilding our fishery because ICCAT doesn't give a quota share back and unless we can figure out how to fly a flight of F-111s backwards through Spain. We're going to be stuck with 30 percent, and that stands a very good chance of going down. And once we lose it, we won't get it back, and there will be no fishery to rebuild it, if we don't hang on to that quota share. And I -- I'm proud that we probably have a greater passion for conservation of these kinds of species in this country than anybody else in the world does, and I prefer to see us maintain that quota share because that way we will continue to harvest that in a sustainable manner. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Will. Louis Daniel?

MR. DANIEL: Thank you, Chris. And I will remind you that, you know, we'll talk about the shark closure. I'm not going to talk about it now. But certainly this -- it pertains to this issue, when we get to that later. So I may have to kind of step back a little bit tomorrow. Certainly, I agree with the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comments made on the quotas and the need to be able to modify these time/area closures in order to have full access to catching the quotas. A lot of folks have worked awful hard to try to get us where we are today. And when we see so much tonnage left over at the end of the fishing year, to lose that would be devastating to our rebuilding efforts.

As far as your evaluation, I would say that you need to look at recoupment. What else are these guys doing? Fishermen are hardworking folks, and when you can -- when they can't fish, they don't go home They do something else. and watch cartoons. And that's my concern about this whole plan. And the -particularly, the closure off North Carolina, but all the closures. And that is what we're seeing these guys do in lieu of what they would normally do in these closed areas. And in -- from some analysis that I've done in North Carolina, instead of fishing a -instead of fishing a bottom Longline, they're fishing 6,000 to 8,000 yards of gillnet, with the by-catch concerns associated with that gear, as well as the interaction with protected resources.

So I think we're extraordinarily myopic in our management of some of these fisheries, not taking into consideration the impacts of some of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

management measures that we put into place. And it's clear that NMFS is very interested in, and trying to be forethoughtful in moving towards a eco-system's fisheries management program. And we're not going to be able to do that, if we continue to look at single species management and some of these closures the way that we've looked at them in the past. And so certainly, there are ways that this group of folks can sit around a table and figure out the most efficient way to manage the resource, get what we want without having an unnecessary burden on the fishermen, which I think we're doing at this particular point in time with some of these closed areas.

So, be more to come on this, lot more to come. But I do think it's important to look at the movement of these fishermen out of these fisheries that they're closed out of and what else they're doing, because in many instances the impacts are contrary to our charge under Magnuson to reduce bycatch. In some fisheries, there are by-catches going up when they move out of some of these closed areas. And so I think it creates a real problem that we need to be more cognizant of as we continue to add on to closed areas and closed seasons.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Louis. Bob Pride.

MR. PRIDE: Thanks, Chris. A couple of things, the first one is I do agree that the closed areas appeared to have worked. I don't object to tweaking them and taking a look at how to make them more efficient those for achieving their objectives and for the industry to have more access to the fishing grounds. The point that Ken made about effort decreasing during these closures is something that I would also be interested in learning more about. And finally, the -- this is not the appropriate venue to discuss it, but I'd like for you to tell us when we can talk about ways that we might increase the utilization of that quota that we're leaving on the table at this point.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Bob. Ellen Peel.

MS. PEEL: Well, I'm going to repeat, but I hope it's taken as reiteration of a lot of the comments said. Obviously, in terms of marlin and all the other species, it's going -- the U.S. is a small percent of the mortality. It's going to take U.S. fishing interests, plural, going to ICCAT in order to have a voice to negotiate for a recovery of, certainly, marlin and other species. The issue of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Swordfish, it was right, we're going to lose the quota, if we don't use it. That though, raises the question, I think, that Bob Pride was hitting on. We have a lot of questions from anglers saying, "If the U.S. cannot take the quota and if the Longline fishery is not going to be able to take it, why are there bag limits on the recreational fishery?"

Our response is, it was identified as a critical life stage for a nursery ground for Swordfish. Is all the juvenile Swordfish present all year or is this a seasonal aggregation? I don't know. But certainly perhaps, that should be looked at. Beginning with the acknowledgement that we've got an international problem and we've got to keep an eye on what we collectively can do at ICCAT. UnforTunately, we also have a domestic problem with the ESA facing us, to that or springing from that, specific to White Marlin. My recollection at the chart that Chris put up earlier and some of the analyses that Dr. Goodyear did back in '98, in the Gulf of Mexico, in that western -- more western central gulf, my recollection was for about a three month period, the interaction with White Marlin was higher there than it was in some of the other areas on the east coast.

That perhaps should be evaluated. The

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

numbers I took down, Chris, were 31, 55, and 418. But back in '98 and '99, I know this area was recommended, but it was not included. I thought that it was a higher rate. That should be looked at compared to some of the other areas. Then to the point of circle hooks that are now mandatory now in the industry. What sort of impact, you know, might that be having? Your numbers, Chris, went through '03. The circle hook mandatory use went into effect, what, in '04. So that may reduce some of the White Marlin by-catch there as well.

What impact do you have numbers yet, are those hooks having on the directed Yellowfin Tuna

What impact do you have numbers yet, are those hooks having on the directed Yellowfin Tuna fishery? Certainly, that has to be looked at. But I think looking at that -- those numbers in that western central gulf certainly should be considered in light of those other very real realities you have to deal with.

MODERATOR CHRISTORPHER ROGERS: Thank you Ellen. Russ Nelson?

MR. NELSON: Yes, I mean, getting stuck here in the middle of the table makes it very difficult to come up with anything original to say.

SPEAKER: We're using a --

MODERATOR CHRISTORPHER ROGERS: I promise

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the next time I'm going to start in the middle.

MR. NELSON: There you go.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Question is which direction do I go when I get there?

MR. NELSON: One observation, and in this, I guess, I'm think of this, given that we're going to have a big national fisheries conference here in town in a few days, and a number of people have brought up this whole idea about a ecosystem type management, what does it mean, and how confusing it is. But one observation I kind of get from this is that we've now talked about a couple of different fisheries. The two closed areas in the Gulf of Mexico that were closed by the Gulf Council to protect aggregations, identified aggregations of gag grouper, were that council could take actions for certain gear, but couldn't prevent bottom Longline gears. So this group has to -- the National Marine -- the HMS office has to try to deal with that.

We're looking at Sawfish and their endangered status and not a major interaction with HMS gear, but the major interaction with other gears, like, trawl, shrimp trawl gear, where this group has to worry about Sawfish. But they can't do anything about that kind of gear that's bothering it. At the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

end, I just think that there are still some structural problems here we have in this country with how we have management set up that keeps us from addressing some of those ecosystem issues. I was looking at the, you know, the table and it's great that, you know, we do have these apparent reductions and discards, and all that are attributed to all of these parts of the closed areas.

I tried to think back to when we were talking about this, six-seven years ago, when we started looking at it. And I recall there was a paper by Jean Cramer that looked at observed -- trips that were observed by actual observers and their reported relative discards in the same times and areas as logbook only trips, where there were no observer's presence, and it wasn't very surprising. There was a difference. Could it be possible that some of those predictions that were made back in 1999, trying to look at what the impacts of these closed areas would be, may have been using the adjusted data, adjusted to account for the difference between observed trips versus unobserved trips.

The new data that you -- the data that you're presenting here is, clearly, just what's been reported in the logbooks, it hasn't been adjusted, so

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

there might be some -- we might not be looking at the same numbers exactly or we might. That would be a good thing to clarify for us in developing your next document, Chris or Margo. You -- I like the way you've presented the data here. But it could be -- it would be possible and I think it would be very helpful for everyone, if you would take you Table 3.116, where you look at the distribution of hooks per area and try to combine it with 3.114, where you've got changes in catch.

It might be -- you might need to do a table for each area, but -- so that we could actually look at each area and look at how the distribution of effort or the number of hooks has specifically affected the catch, both discarded and by-catch within each of those areas. Particularly, I think, given the discussion about some folks' desire to alter the current closures, that having it broken down into a more finer resolution like that would be helpful. And I would like to caution people too, before we become too, you know, polyanna(phonetic) is about the switch to circle hooks in the Longline fishery, which definitely is going to have a major positive impact on the turtle conservation, which -- we do need to take a look at

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

some good data on what has happened --what happens with finfish catch, and by-catch, and survivability based on that.

I think I recall from the -- some of the work that was done on that. In fact, shark -- or at least blue shark catch increased in the Longline fisheries on the circle hooks versus the J-hooks. That area up there was certainly not conducive to looking at billfish in general, which are warmer water species. But we need to look at it. Certainly, the fish are going to be in better condition, I think, with the circle hooks. But we also need to look and see if there is any increase in hookup efficiency or catchability associated with that, that might off set. So that's just another piece of good science and good data that we need to take a look at. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Ross. Bob, Bob Zales?

MR. ZALES: Yes, I would just want to encourage you to come up with a compatible regulations for the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat areas, and in your comments and your cons in here, because we went through something similar to this with the reef fish fishery and also the coastal pelagics fishery in there. And the economic burden that you talk about,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it could have an economic burden on HMS fisheries in these areas, including the shark bottom Longline fishery. Madison-Swanson, which I'm very familiar with is 100 square miles and there doesn't appear to be a significant shark fishery in that particular area.

certainly wouldn't be anymore significant than the reef fish fishery -- commercial reef fish fishery was in that area. So if we can't envision too much of a problem there. And in the pelagic Longline fishery, I don't ever remember seeing a pelagic Longline laid in that area. There could have been one around there, but I haven't seen it, and I have fished it for years and people that I have talked to, they do fishing a whole lot longer than me, haven't seen that much in there. The -- we're talking about the (inaudible) year round burden on the nontrawling sector of the recreational fishery, that would be the reef fish fishermen. And initially when Madison-Swanson was set up, there were some minor comments about some of the recreational reef fish fishermen.

But today, when you get in that area, I would challenge you to find any recreational fishermen to say that that area hasn't done a good thing, and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that are going to complain about being shut out of that area for reef fish, for doing the purpose that it was designed to do, to protect spawning aggregation of gags. And the surface trawling part of it is -- we talk about it may be difficult to enforce. It's one of the problems with enforcement that we've constantly heard is the fact that you allow bottom Longline shark fishery, the pelagic thing, and that creates a problem in enforcement.

There have been several cases made of enforcement and the biggest one, I guess, would be Greg Abrams with a \$80,000 fine that he got for fishing in there. But if you can bring it compatible to what the Gulf has done, that would dramatically increase the enforcement effort. It'd make it a lot easier to do. So we would encourage you to do that for that area there. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, thank you. Bob Hueter.

MR. HUETER: Thank you, Chris. I just want to say a brief word about the Sawfish. I just want to say that I personally am not a big fan of overreaction to the plight of charismatic species. And I deal with this myself in scientific collection operations.

So I'm not a charismatic species hugger myself. But

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

in the case of the small tooth Sawfish, this is truly a unique and special part of our marine biodiversity with this outrageous saw. These animals are relatives of the sharks. They are the largest species of ray; get to be about 20 feet long, used to. If anyone wants to see pictures of animals that big, I've got them on my computer back here.

On that map up there, if you look up there, there used to be common inshore all the way from the Texas border up to Chesapeake Bay. Probably, perhaps millions of animals before the early 1930s and after gillnets were introduced into inshore waters, they've been extirpated down to, approximately we estimate, several 1000 animals left in the Florida Everglades. So, as you know, this species was listed under the ESA as the first fully marine fish to be declared endangered in U.S. waters, thanks to the efforts of Sonja and others like her. And in this particular case then, given all of that, I would say that in the case of the -- the small tooth Sawfish, every individual fish may count.

And I don't say that lightly, as a scientist. I don't believe that in many cases, but I do believe that in this particular case that every individual Sawfish that is protected, that is saved

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

from mortality, one way or the other, does count in terms of rebuilding the population of these very special animals. So to that extent, I would ask NMFS to go the extra mile in protecting this particular species, which -- we're not talking about it possibly being on the endangered species list. It is declared endangered species. The other fisheries interacting with it beyond the bottom Longline fishery, Russell already mentioned, the shrimp trawl fishery, that's true. Recreational hook and line is the other major interacting fishery, let's not forget that.

But in the case of the bottom Longline fishery, even though -- if you'll look in the document, the numbers appear to be very small. Those are the observed numbers. And it talks about how 100 percent of those fish were released alive. Well, we don't really know what the post release mortality is on these animals. They probably are very tolerant of hooks. But, 100 percent, I'm not sure. So in this case, in which every individual animal probably does count, I think we should go the extra mile in protecting this species. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Sonja.

MS. FORDHAM: I'm all choked up.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Laughter)

MS. FORDHAM: You can write down that I agree with everything that Bob said. But just to follow up and to clarify, the recovery -- the Sawfish recovery team is looking at all fisheries and all threats. And I think that process is thorough, it's not very speedy, though. So I would again like to commend you for coordinating -- I assume you're coordinating with your protected resources people. And I'm really glad to see that it's really encouraging. Because this process is so slow, again it's an opportunity to get some urgently needed protective measures, and before the recovery plan is complete. I assume you'll continue to work with your protected resources people when designing proposed closed area. And I assume you know that Mote Marine Lab is doing the real cutting edge research on Sawfish, and I'm sure we'll be happy to consult in that design.

You should keep in mind that the Sawfish recovery team is meeting in June at Mote. So I'm hoping maybe the draft will be out by then and we could comment as a group or take a look at it as a group. So I look forward to that. I do need to consult with my turtle people about effects on --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

closure effects on turtles. But I can tell you that my fish colleagues strongly support the proposed complimentary measures in the Gulf of Mexico to protect gag grouper and we're very appreciative that that's in the pre-draft. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Sonja. Frank Blount.

MR. BLOUNT: Yes, thank you, Chris. As

MR. BLOUNT: Yes, thank you, Chris. As Russell said, it's hard to come up with anything new at this stage of the game. But I agree totally with what Bill Gerencer said and also with Bob Pride. But Bob Pride also left you with a question that I'm not sure if we got an answer to. When would the appropriate time to discuss ways to increase the Swordfish catch be on the agenda?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Why not take a look at the agenda and I'll report back right after lunch, where we could fit that in?

MR. BLOUNT: Okay, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Mike Leech?

MR. LEECH: Couple of things: one, I'm confused on why we manage Bluefin Tuna as an east and west stock and there's so much mixing of the two stocks. And yet, White Marlin and Swordfish, which are very definitely east and west stocks -- the last

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

information I saw, in the last 50 years, it was maybe three White Marlin that had been documented as crossing the Atlantic, and maybe four or five Swordfish, maybe that's changed. But, basically, the White Marlin that are over in the Azores, and the Canary Islands, and Morocco aren't coming over here, and the ones that migrate from the northeast through the Gulf of Mexico and down to Venezuela don't go over there.

I think what we need to be concentrating on, and this, I'm sure, is an ICCAT issue, is protecting the White Marlin and the Swordfish on our side of the Atlantic, and not worrying about the Atlantic white and what the Spanish are doing over there because it really doesn't affect our stocks of fish. That's one point that I think should be addressed. And I'm probably in the minority when I'm questioning whether or not Swordfish have really been rebuilt. There is a lot of baby Swordfish out in the Straits of Florida. No question that there is a lot more Swordfish than there used to be three or four years ago.

But the statistics that we've developed from all the Swordfish tournaments and also talking to the hand-gear commercial guys is that about 3 or 4 percent of the Swordfish that are caught are -- have reached

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the 150-pound average spawning size, where a female will spawn for the first time. Which means 96-97 percent are juvenile Swordfish and I don't consider that rebuilt. What I consider rebuilt is when you've got a healthy spawning stock biomass and not just a bunch of babies. The statistics I'm looking at, though, are only in the Straits of Florida. I have no idea what's going on in the rest of the Swordfish range.

But I think that's a major concern and just because we've got a lot of babies out there, doesn't mean, at least in my mind, that we've rebuilt the fishery. One of the things that I think NMFS needs to do a contract to have done is do a socio-economic study of the value of the recreational Swordfish fishery that's sprung up in the last four, five, six years, and also the value of the commercial hand-gear fishery that's become quite substantial. There is a bunch of hand-gear guys out that are allowed to fish in the closed area. And if you're going to evaluate the economic impacts of these closed areas, you also need to factor in the benefits of the economic increases that have come from these others. don't do that study and you have no information, how can you evaluate the economic impacts? Because one

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

may offset, or partially offset, or maybe more than offset the other, we just don't know because there's been no information generated on that. So I would urge you to do that socio-economic homework.

The tournament statistics: now, we've got three years of tournament statistics. Last year there were eight Swordfish tournaments. The catch rate and the average size of the tournament catches are going down, not up. That's something to be concerned about. And also it's almost impossible to get up-to-date statistics from NMFS on the hand-gear guys. 2004 statistics is a military secret, but 2002 versus 2003, the catch rate and the average size is going down for the hand-gear guys too in the Straits of Florida. So everything may not be as rosy as everybody seems to think it is. No question that the closed areas have been successful. And I would question why we would want to mess something that's been successful.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Mike. Any other speakers? Rick Weber.

MR. WEBER: First thing I'd like to do is echo -- Mike's at least concerned that rebuilding may not have occurred on a slow-growing fish and in a -- in what appears to be a relatively short time. I'm happy that we're seeing signs, but something just

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

doesn't feel like we're up to a really rebuilt situation. Echoing what everyone has said, or most people have said is that those closures were also put in for Swordfish. In truth I'm still looking for an action that is directed towards marlin. Even the circle hooks that we're discussing were put in due to turtles. The closures that we're happy are helping the marlin were put in for Swordfish.

Imagine what we could do if we did something that was directly aimed for the marlin. And we do have things in the near future that could be causing that, you know. We should at least look at closures that will be aimed at helping marlin.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Rick. Bob Fitzpatrick.

MR. FITZPATRICK: I'd have a whole lot to say, but I've learnt that at times I should shut my mouth. I'll pass.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We respect your decision. John Graves.

MR. GRAVES: First of all, representing the Advisory Committee, I want to point out that with the U.S. not taking its quota, that in 2006 with the allocation discussions, we will use it if -- we will lose it if we don't use it. And in fact, if you look

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

at it in '06, we're going to be having -- the best data would be '05. We're in -- you know, we're going to start the '05 fishing year. There is not a lot of And if people are -- you know, we can talk about a North Atlantic white stock. But if you look at where -- that our most serious vocal quota grabs are going to come from, it's going to come from our neighbors to the south, Mexico is going to be there. And so think about the implication of that. Is Mexico going to have a fishery that's a -- that has -- takes the mitigation efforts that we do? We're going to increase the by-catch for a lot of these animals and it's not going to be resource-friendly. So I think we really need to plan for that. And I -- we certainly support any effort to increase the U.S. Longline fishery, but at the same time, protect as best we can, our by-catch species.

In terms of Swordfish, in '02, they had data through '01. The biomass at that time was in the mid 90s relative to the biomass necessary for maximum sustainable yield. So since '01, we've had five years. At a time, when we have been harvesting much less in the North Atlantic stock, the yield of that stock, so we're banking those fish, and so the age distribution of landings has increased, and that will

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

come out in the assessment. But I think we've been very resource-friendly there.

The argument that if we give up our quota, we give up our voice at ICCAT. I used to rebut Glenn and Nelson with, "Well, that's kind of strange because we don't harvest too many whales. Yet, we happened to have a nice voice at IWC." But I have been to ICCAT now many times and it's just more than trying to direct it on the floor. It turns out that our commission -- our commercial fishermen, our pelagic Longliners have a lot of interactions outside of plenary with the fishermen from the other nations, and that if we want to pass on ways of mitigating interactions with turtles, that's the best way to do it.

If we see that we have actually removed our fleet entirely from the floor, other fisheries aren't going to -- other countries' fishermen aren't going to want to be following that, you know. And so I -- to keep our voice, to keep transferring technology, we have to maintain our fishery, and it has to be viable fishery.

So while we can reduce gear conflicts, we can do -- tweak the existing areas to minimize by-catch, I certainly would do everything that we can to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

promote the few -- the full utilization of our quota.

Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, John. It's noon now, so a few more comments, then we'll break for lunch. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, I just -- few things here. The closure off North Carolina -- I know we'll address the petition later. It's had a great economic effect on a lot of fishermen on that fishing area that need that. Some of us had to do different things, some of us -- some went out of the business. I'll just give you a little bit of a instance for a -- in 1993, when I started shark fishing, there was 18 boats, say, on December 31st, that would make a set to go shark fishing.

Last year there was, I think, five or six boats that would go shark fishing. This year there was none. This closure, the modifications, I think there could have been a little more forthcoming, when Natural Marine Fisheries with some transparency in some of their data. I think it was -- when you look at the reduction for juveniles, as they say it's for, you look at other fisheries in state waters, other places that maybe could have had a part of reduction, so you wouldn't had to have this gigantic closure.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

But we'll address that later.

I've heard a lot of people talk about the Sawfish around here, I've never caught one, or never seen one. But when National Marine Fisheries starts entering data, and I believe there has only been seven observed takes by the bottom Longline fishery, I might be wrong in reading that. But when you read that and the National Marine Fisheries does the expanded take of over 450, I started to notice something -- there has got to be some type of closed area. And when National Marine Fisheries starts doing their expanded take on something most time you -- from a fisherman's point of view, you'd better watch out.

The other thing talking about the White Marlin, and the closures, and the more wants of the closures, the U.S. commercial fishermen and including myself, I'm a three to five day boater, when the --when we had to go take the circle hook effect, I had probably -- I had 600 brand new hooks of a J-hook that I can't use no more. I had all my other hooks I had to cut out. When is it not enough that the U.S. commercial pelagic Longline fisherman's had enough?

You look at the White Marlin -- why don't the recreational industry step up to the plate and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

want to do circle hooks? They do circle hooks in all of their studies, in the different studies I've read in the different places like Panama or doing stuff like that. Why is it -- if it's good for the commercial guy and it's good for all the research from the recs., why isn't it good for the recreational industry? I mean we can totally close this out and then when you go to ICCAT, you look at the other things. I think, one thing that the U.S. commercial fishermen should do, if it continues like this, is to really tell the ICCAT nations exactly what's happens here in the U.S. Because this seems very two-faced that when's enough enough?

I mean we're doing all of this stuff to rebuild the stocks, we can do very little. This fish was given to the recreational industry in 1988. I mean you might have interaction when -- but I mean, you know, the only interaction you'll have is not to be in the water and that's not a -- that's not good for me. But why we aren't looking at the observer or at the hooks for circle hooks, if it's such a great research?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We will take that up this afternoon under rebuilding for Billfish.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Jim Donofrio, last comment, Mr. Camhi, do you have any comment on this? Okay, so Jim, last word, and then we'll break for lunch.

MR. DONOFRIO: Chris, thank you. The RFA is going to be sending in detailed comments on the time and area closures that will be consistent with our intervention in the ESA litigation.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. I know there has been a couple of requests to go back to this after lunch. We've, I guess you could say, lost our gains we made yesterday. Our under harvest was carried forward and now we're in a over harvest situation. We've got to get back on track. We'd missed our public comment period that I wanted to get into right after lunch. And then get into the rebuilding for Finetooth sharks and billfish. many more comments on this closed area subject? Just Bobbi, and Glenn, and Henry Ansley, Pete Manuel. right. How long do we need to close this subject right now? Five minutes? All right. Bobbi, Bobbi Walker.

MS. WALKER: Chris, mine's a quick question.

Being familiar with working in FMPs and the time that it takes to implement them, it seems to me that it's a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

moot point over our Swordfish quota, us losing it because the stock assessment will done in 2006, this plan will be implemented probably by the time the stock assessment is done. So my question to you is it a moot point to address closed areas to reopen them to allow the Swordfish to be harvested or is it a moot point?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, it's certainly not a moot point, if it's the right thing to do. And the question is, if it is the right thing to do, will it be done fast enough to have any effect on the ICCAT negotiations? Unlikely, given the, as John Graves has stated, the fact that the next assessment will be only using 2005 data. But, obviously any changes that we envision having -- any changes that have occurred or we envision that will be occurring at the point where we are in those negotiations at ICCAT will be a valid point for us to raise. In that we can reflect on our recent catch history and say that this is not necessarily reflective of what we believe will be happening currently and in the next two years. So that provides us some argument power, I guess you could say, for maintaining our quota share at ICCAT.

MS. WALKER: All right, one quick question.

Has a country ever loaned their quota to another

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

country?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: In fact, with respect to Swordfish, we have done that to Japan to help them out of a by-catch exceedance that they had.

And there are other examples with respect to Bluefin and other species. Pete Manuel, we hadn't heard from him yet. So let's get Pete.

MR. MANUEL: Thank you. It seems obvious to me just listening, there is a balance missing. And maybe a solution to that would be to issue some fishing vessel permits for some of the Longline people and let them try some of these areas. And look at where they could expand, and look at what their bycatch may be, and put observers on there. I mean, it can't all be one-sided. They need to get -- be able to get back and make a living again. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Pete. Dick Stone?

MR. STONE: Chris, very quickly, I just want to reiterate a comment that was already been made about the more specific data that we can have to make these decisions will be helpful.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, Glenn and Nelson can you confer and have one person speak, so we can get on with lunch.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

MR. BEIDEMAN: Glenn.

ULRICH: Just a bunch of MR. random responses. I though I heard somebody say Swordfish is a slow-growing fish. It is a relatively rapidly growing, highly migratory fish that's -- has an early age of maturity and high fecundity. And the fact that we have been able to -- it's a very robust stock in terms of its ability to rebuild, and that is exactly what has been manifested. So I don't know if that -maybe I heard the wrong thing, it's -- maybe somebody was talking about sharks instead of Swordfish. another comment; I was a little interested in hearing that 96 to 97 percent of the fish being caught in eight Swordfish tournaments in the Straits of Florida. Swordfish nursery grounds is occurring and I think that's something that, probably, needs to be focused on. I'm not quite sure what we're doing there. to find that there are a lot of juveniles in a nursery area does not speak to the status of the overall stock in the North Atlantic. I'm stating the obvious, I suppose.

But back to another point about ICCAT. Your point I think, Chris, that you were making and I'll just reiterate is that the -- being able -- you know, having negotiated a few things at ICCAT over the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

years, I could certainly make great hay with being able to point to some fundamental changes in the access of our fishery to the resource, as a basis for thwarting efforts to reallocate our quota. There have been, you know, innumerable instances where nations point to actions taken domestically as the basis for management decisions that are made for the future. So, you know, granted, we'd love to have five years of data show that we're back up to full utilization, that's not realistic. But certainly the management measure changes and increasing our access to the resource would be a very valid negotiating point. And there was one more thing that I've --

MR. BEIDEMAN: '07, that --

MR. ULRICH: You've got it I think -- quick.

SPEAKER: We'll try to put the assessment and, you know, revaluating the quotas after '07. But chances are it's going to take place in '06.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you all. Let's have a lunch break and report back here at 1:15 P.M. sharp, so we can get started on rebuilding of -- well, actually, let's have our public comment period quickly to summarize the three topics this morning, the EFH, and the time/area closures and by-catch.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

(Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N 1:15 p.m.

MRS. DICK: -- His options and comment deadlines of NOAA fisheries. Our guest commenting on these HMS pre-draft issues today is a pioneer historical participant in the HMS fisheries for over 26 years. A private sector careful handling and release gear technologist and manufacturing company for over 13 years.

A fisheries partner with no fisheries resource managers Florida Sea Grant industry, NGOs, gear technicians and researchers as well as a conservation organization. Workshops can be an extremely valuable management tool that can be used to inform, educate, share ideas and give a feeling of accomplishment and participation in the management and conservation process.

As stated in the issues and options paper there is a widespread acceptance, support and desire to accomplish such workshops by industry both recreational and commercial, the HMS AP, the Agency, councils and NGOs. The BiOp for amendment one to the HMS FMP requires that NOAA Fisheries implement a series of workshops or other training programs.

In the GN1 2004, ESA Section 7 consultation

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

BiOp, on the reinitiation of consultation on the Atlantic PLL, Fishery for HMS, workshops and training on the proper careful handling and release protocols are a critical component. The reasonable -- and the reasonable printed alternatives that will enable the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico commercial pelagic Longline fishery to continue to maintain a sustainable fishery.

This year's -- 2004 BiOp highlights the benefits of mandatory commercial workshops to reduce Sea Turtle post-release mortality. A combination of mandatory commercial and voluntary recreational workshops could teach the HMS fishing community how to reduce interactions in mortality of Sea Turtles as well as other by-catch in a timely fashion.

Workshops could stimulate compliance with current and proposed management permitting -- and requirements by explaining the benefits of such training and compliance. The June 2004 BiOp RPAs place heavy emphasis on the need for outreach and educational workshops, in order to ensure that circle hooks and careful handling and release equipment are used correctly, and at the level of success that was observed and documented with 100 percent observer coverage in the Northeast Distant Experiment.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ARK recommends that these workshops; recreational and commercial, become a top priority, and be immediately implemented for all HMS hook and line fisheries, in order to gain maximum benefit from these successful mitigation technologies of fishing practices.

Under Section 2.1.1.1 workshops Sea Turtle release and disentanglement workshops for pelagic Longline fishermen. Alternative one, says, "No action status quo voluntary workshops in current regulations." ARK is opposed to Alternative 1 and believes that a no action alternative will not adequately address the informational and attitudinal constraints in regard to careful handling and release of Sea Turtles and other by-catch.

The consensus of industry leaders supports mandatory workshops for PLL fishermen. Industry is anxious to continue to develop proper handling and release skills, species identification and gain a better understanding of management regulations in order to maintain a sustainable, environmentally safe fishery. Alternative 2, "Mandatory workshops and certification for all PLL vessel captains with additional information disseminated through the activities, NMFFS PLL POC. Alternative 2 is ARK's

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

preferred alternative for the following reasons.

The question of who should be trained and certified through the workshop process has been brought up on numerous occasions among the industry leaders. Optimally, all crewmember and captain should receive careful handling and release training and certification either from the workshop process or from the trained captain. It's not logistically feasible to have all the crew trained at workshops.

Not many crewmembers would attend a mandatory workshop mainly due to logistics and finance. Even if one additional crewmember participated in the workshop process, it is not likely that the other one to four crewmembers would or could attend. Crewmembers can be transient in nature and are always shifting from one vessel to another and from one fishery to another.

Most crewmembers give their allegiance to the captain of the vessel that they are on at time. Each captain has its own method of fishing practices and safety requirements unique to the captain's particular vessel. Captain usually stays on one vessel throughout the season, has ultimate authority at sea, is responsible for all safety at sea issues, has the most at sea experience, and can be trained at

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

mandatory workshops to instruct all crewmembers on their particular vessel of concern.

The consensus of most PLL industry leaders is they would prefer the captains to train their own crewmembers due to several reasons. Crewmembers often change from trip to trip and vessel to vessel, and the captain should be able, and qualified to train all new crewmembers as they come on board. The captains are almost always present, and on the back deck when a marine turtle is encountered due and part to the slowing of the vessel, and bringing it to stop at many release scenarios.

Potential safety at sea issues that may exist from vessel to vessel due to the size and configuration of the hauling stations and doors, et cetera and preference of the captain for certain release scenarios that they have found were better and safer for them from experience in the field. ARK found merit in the industry leaders' suggestions and thus we want to propose three different mandatory training processes.

One, Initial training for those who are just beginning -- just being introduced to the workshop process; familiarizing with the tools and the protocols. Second, certification level training which

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

deals with extensive hands-on training, and rigorous evaluations of that training, and if successful, industry level certification.

And third, instructor level training and industry certification for those captains who have already completed the initial and advanced industry certification workshops, and have proven to have significant experience in the field of proper handling and release protocols and techniques. It may be beneficial to have captains trained and certified to train all other crewmembers on their particular vessel to address the above concerns.

ARK has the capability of training instructors on the proper manner and method in which to instruct crewmembers. This instructor level training may prove to be more efficient and cost effective as well as make the captain ultimately responsible for his own vessel and crew. allow some flexibility to the captain to adopt the protocols and make improvements or slight modifications to the handling and release procedure, especially if it deals with some potential safety as sea issue or a particular way the captain prefers to run his ship.

As long as a captain is well trained, has

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

completed both the initial and advanced training, is properly evaluated and certified, and has experience at sea. This will provide incentives to those captains that have already completed the initial advance training programs that have experience at sea, and have proven that they the high level motivation and proficiency of the 2004 BiOp mandates.

Section 2.1.1.2 workshops HMS and protected resources identification. Alternative 2, conduct voluntary workshops at a scientific facility marine laboratory for all commercial and recreational HMS fishermen and permitted dealers on addressing first come first serve basis. ARK recommends Alternative 2 combined with Alternative 3 and 4 commercial workshops, which is well defined in manageable universe of vessels, will be limited in number financial burden and workshop location, compared to the recreational venues, which is much larger, and a less defined universe of vessel.

Multiple venue locations, and all the geographical locations will be necessary to conduct voluntary workshops in this sector. Alternative 3, conduct one or several voluntary workshops at one or several locations per region; Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, North Atlantic for all commercial and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

recreational HMS fishermen and permitted dealers on a first come first serve basis. Stakeholder leaders could help organize workshops and set up appropriate venues in the geographical region that they have the best ability to outreach to their own constituents.

The commercial sector could be responsible for their workshops and criteria and the recreational sector could be responsible for their sectors workshops, criteria and venues. Alternative 4, developing interacting voluntary web-based tutorial for all commercial and recreational HMS fishermen and permitted dealers. ARK recommends this Alternative 4 as well in combination with Alternatives 2 and 3.

Developing an interactive, voluntary web-based tutorial for all commercial and recreational HMS fishermen and permitted dealers is critical to help disseminate information to the largest audience in the most cost effective manner. This alternative should be used in combination with others to form a suite of alternatives that best fits the need and desired results.

Alternative 5, conduct one or more mandatory workshops for commercial and recreational HMS fishermen and permitted dealers; either one workshop or one workshop per region, Gulf of Mexico, South

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Atlantic and North Atlantic. Mandatory workshops, just by the nature of definition "mandatory," would initially have higher attendance levels than that of voluntary workshops.

But every long haul voluntary workshops are would obtrusive -eventually gain non attendance, recreationally due to the nature of the fishery, it's size and characteristics as well as the positive peer pressure of benefits and word of mouth. In the commercial sector is the well defined universe of vessels. Mandatory workshops would be feasible and cost effective, although several industry leaders have suggested that most of the commercial captains are well versed in identification of various species, and would prefer voluntary workshops to augment theirs or to their crews' identification skills rather than being forced to attend mandatory workshops that they may or may not need.

The recreational sector is not well defined in vessels and is extremely large compared to the commercial sector. Thus mandatory workshops in this sector would not be feasible or logistically possible.

On the other hand voluntary workshops with benefits and incentives such as enjoy the day with the family at Mount Marine, Sea World, Gulf world Marine Park, et

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cetera may attract more participants by allowing them to participate on a first come first serve basis. This type of identification workshop process would provide valuable data on the fishery, workshop success and participation. Industry leaders could help simulate -- stimulate participation from within their own constituent groups. Thanks. MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you 9 very much. Would you have a copy eventually to --MRS. DICK: Should it --10 11 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: The -- a written copy for us. 12 MRS. DICK: Yes, it's --13 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Not necessary 14 for today, but --15 MRS. DICK: It's a little thick, but I just 16 kind of picked it out. 17 MRS. DICK: Okay. Great. 18 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Is there any 19 questions or? Any questions from panel members? 20 SPEAKER: No. 21 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay 22 MRS. DICK: Thank you. 23 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Any other 24

members of the public, okay.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

www.nealrgross.com

MR. DICK: Good Afternoon. My name is Shawn Dick. I am the president of Aquatic Release Conservation. We're a private sector gear technician and manufacturing company. We believe that we're one of the stakeholders in the HMS Fisheries. It's an honor and a pleasure to be here in front of the distinguished AP members, which we consider as all experts in their particular field.

I'm going to comment more from a layman's point of view or a common sense perspective rather than from the, you know, as a technical that my wife just did. It's obvious that there's a extremely diverse group of experts on the panel. They're all representing various constituents, objectives.

There's a -- one thing that I've noticed from sitting here is there's an overarching theme, there is an objective, there's benefits to each constituent group and that's by-catch reduction. by-catch mortality reduction and by-catch reduction seems to be a common goal and a common theme that I keep hearing over and over again at these HMS APs. It seems like the one issue that pretty much everybody agrees on. I hear it time and time and time again. How to get to that end issue is in dispute sometimes.

Workshops, in my opinion, are probably one

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of the most -- the best valuable management tool that we could possibly have. It has many benefits, it reaches out to your own particular constituent groups, it gives a chance to camaraderie, it gives a chance to sit down and analyze what the problems are, and more importantly to come up with solutions. It's an excellent education and outreach venue. I think it's a really good management tool. It helps share ideas, it helps work out a lot of the problems before they get up into a higher level of litigation, which is a really costly event for everybody and really slows down the management process.

One thing that I heard today, probably hit me the best was when Dick Stone said the Agency should contract with industry, and this is the key to workshop success. It'd be very difficult and very costly and very burdensome for the Agency to try to go into these different fisheries and tell these groups what to do and how to do it, you know. On the commercial sector you have Rusty Hudson you have Nelson Beideman, and Willy.

These guys are experts on how to gather their fishermen together and make them come to the workshops and I believe that they have said over, over and over again that they wish to have mandatory

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

workshops for the reason that they want to prove to the other stakeholders and they want to hone their skills on by-catch reduction and by-catch mortality reduction. They want it documented with a 100 percent observer coverage.

I hear at three or four years in a row that they're saying we need mandatory compliance, we need mandatory workshops, we want the training, we want the skills. And that can easily be done, I think, as Nelson said earlier there is a universe of about a 105 vessels. Of those 105 vessels, probably 98 percent of them are already in compliance with careful handling and release technologies; circle hooks.

There has been a series of workshops that have been performed by the Agency, and as the biological opinion required that a series of workshops be performed in 2005, which was not able to be performed by the Agency due to amendment two, but industry took the lead and started to work in partnership with the Agency to make these workshops available to their fishers.

So that they could be trained at the high level proficiency that was given to the NED and in some cases at even a higher level of proficiency. In the recreational sector it seems like we're hearing

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

over and over again that mandatory workshops are not feasible, that voluntary workshops would be a preferable type of workshop program, and the concept, I've talked with Mike Clarke, Sea Grant fellow at NMFS several times, and we've discussed this in many different areas.

Partnerships with -- such as with RFA and IGFA, billfish, CCA, if he could take their constituents groups; they know him the best, and they are well respected. If they could be in charge of their own groups -- and a lot of people say, "Well, you know, the workshop process may or may not work," but I believe that you know we should give it a chance.

Let these leaders of the industry take their groups and let's voluntarily, maybe on a sort of like a pilot program for three years, allow them to reach out to their constituent's groups, and see if we can get some voluntary workshop compliance. What we need to make the workshop process work is help from all the stakeholders, and the highly migratory species; the nature of that fishery; we need management throughout the entire range.

And one thing that I'm afraid is going to come and slip up on is, I heard it from Glenn and Dr.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Graves and several other people, we have a international component that's actually, I think we really need to pay attention to. We need to keep our ICCAT quota. If the U.S does not lead the example, and set the way as far as workshops, compliance with careful handling and release technologies, then it's going to be impractical for us to believe that any other international -- country which doesn't even comply with any -- the international laws will even began to start any kind of by-catch mortality reduction or by-catch reduction.

So it's critically important that I believe that the U.S fisheries stay together as a group and set the pace, the pattern, and transfer this technologies. And I think I heard another AP member say that it's not going to be a good example if we keep closing our fisheries as an example of how we're succeeding in by-catch reduction. Here again I'm just commenting as a, you know, as through common senses and as a layman, I don't have all the data in front of me.

I know that there's been -- several times people said they were responsible for probably about five percent of the Sea Turtle mortality in the U.S., which means that there is probably about 95 percent

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

responsibility internationally, and I haven't seen any type of international compliance with by-catch reduction measures until the U.S. started to adopt the technology and proved that it worked within its own group.

Again, I think that to make workshops and by-catch reduction successful, we need help from all the stakeholders. Academia is -- gives us the critically needed data that we need. Without the data, I think I heard Rusty say several times, you know, "We need the science." That's absolutely correct in my opinion from the public.

We need the science to give us the information. We need the environmental groups as a check and a balance. We need the commercial sector to supply the food source, not just for the U.S. population that doesn't have access to our common resource. I think I heard somebody say that we only supply one quarter of our own sea food. That means that we're reliant about three quarters on the other countries to supply it to us with less quality controls, with less by-catch reduction measures.

The recreational fishery has many benefits.

Not only do they -- you know, there is a business in the recreational fishery. A lot of people make their

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

money from it. There is another aspect of the recreational fisheries that I have been working with lately, and that's the youth anglers; that's the new generation coming up.

I've worked with Florida and Texas IGFA on teaching their youth anglers ethical angling techniques, careful handling and release technologies. We're now partner-shipping with RFA. It's very important that we understand what the youth anglers are going to do from the experts and from the old guard in the field that's sitting here at the HMS AP today. We need -- we critically, critically, need NGO support, not only for the checks and balances; we need financial support.

The Agency cannot bear the burden of doing recreational workshops for the next three years over the entire geographical region. We need the oversight in transparency that NGOs always assure us. We need their expertise. More importantly we need their international pressure on the other countries that are not complying, which in my opinion from sitting from the outside looking in, is our largest problem.

I want to end up by saying that if we work together instead of against each other, it looks like the U.S. has pretty much always lead the way in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

conservation. And I kind of look at the fisheries as a U.S. fisheries. I don't really like to look at it as commercial and recreational. Here again, that's from a layman's point of view. I think that to make the workshop process work we need a steering committee or something like a steering committee.

If we look at the success that was in the NED, we found out that there was key components that made that NED experiment work. And that was Agency working with researchers working with industries, sitting down at a table and hashing out the differences long before the fishers were told what to do, and how to do it correctly. And then the fishers turned around and came back to the table and told us how to do it better.

Everybody has an expertise in a particular field; if you put all of these expertises together in a steering committee, commercially, recreationally, environmentally, academically, then we would have a working workshop process which is outreach in education. There are some that say that, you know, "There's rare occurrences in some of the fisheries," which I agree with.

But there is not rare occurrences with shark and some of the other by-catch species, and some of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

these same careful handling and release technologies work on other by-catch species exactly the same way. I think it's really important that we have identification workshops, and I think I have heard different stakeholders here at the table and different HMS AP members say, "We'll offer our venue to you to make these identification workshops work.

I personally have been down at Mount Marine science lab; they have a beautiful facility, and we've given several workshops on Sea Turtle handling as well as shark observer programs down there before. If we have these people that are willing to offer their multi million dollar facilities and their personnel to help us out, you know, I would advice the Agency to seriously consider accepting their offers.

Same with International Game Fish Association; they have a beautiful facility in south Florida. They have very well expertise -- trained personnel. They have an observer program, I think, of over 500 people, already. It'd very easy to interface with these people, and to train them in the way that the Agency would want the people to be trained.

So I -- here again, I see that there's a -- I know there's a lot of problems in the workshop process, and there's a lot of problems in between the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

recreational and commercial fisheries, in between the Agency and NGOs, but it seems to me from looking from the outside as the public and then from a layman that if we work together for a common U.S. fishery, that we would and could succeed in the workshop process, and the workshop process would help us succeed in the bycatch reduction and by-catch mortality reduction.

I appreciate the time, we have the technology and expertise to accomplish the goal of global by-catch mortality by working together for the future of our fisheries and for the future generations of our fisheries. I'll be glad to answer any questions if there is any by the panel, and I appreciate your time today.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you Shawn. Any particular questions, Joe McBride?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, thank you Mr. Dick for a very nice presentation. Something you might want to consider in conjunction with the Agency; to reach the recreational community which is impossible to logistically put them all together for workshop A and workshop B is one of these, I think -- what do they call them on Sundays, saltwater Sunday or something where they have sport fishing, saltwater sport fishing on ESPN, and in conjunction with the Agency and

yourselves, you could have a forum for reduction of mortality as well as a forum for sale of whatever items you sell to help in decreasing the mortality, mutual type of scenario that could reach and people who are sitting home all winter and delighted to watch something educational in the fishery field. Just a suggestion I mean, it's worthwhile.

MR. DICK: Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, we are a bit behind on this afternoon's agenda. We're scheduled for a break right now, but I'm sure you've had enough of those today, right. What we're getting into now with rebuilding and preventing overfishing. We wanted to address this concept or issue with respect to both Finetooth sharks and billfish, then take a break at 5:00 p.m. and get into Bluefin Tuna recreational management and monitoring.

I suspect we'll need another break before 5:00, and we'll probably try to arrange it at maybe about 3:30 or so. But I did have one lingering question from this morning; the concept of addressing the issue of revitalizing the U.S. Swordfish fishery, and where we could work in a discussion on that.

I would just note that part of the outcome we would suspect of revaluating and potentially

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

revising or modifying area closures could to some extent address some of the issues with respect to the Swordfish fishery in access to productive Swordfishing grounds while still avoiding by-catch; that will certainly be an issue that will be addressed.

Another concept that was raised was dealing with access by commercial hand-gear fishery. If you recall in our document, certain issues that were discussed during the scoping period, but were determined not to be addressable at this time due to the sheer volume of the activities required to put this document and continue on with the process.

We did intend to revisit the limited access program, but in a subsequent rule making. So that's really not on the table for this go around, just because -- again, the timing of this document -- already some concerns expressed about getting this plan consolidation and amendment completed as soon as possible so that we can start building a new image, a new catch history with respect to ICCAT in our quota. So those are two areas that I'd heard this morning that might address the problem of gaining or regaining access to our Swordfish allocation.

But to the extent that other ideas might be presented and forthcoming. I'd asks folks to ponder

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that, I don't see any time on the agenda for this afternoon or this evening, but certainly tomorrow in that area beyond the afternoon break, we'll have the North Carolina petition for rule making on the shark closed area, some discussion of HMS enforcement issues and another probably common periods are -- I would hope that some time in that two to three hour period in the afternoon we can work in the discussion. But again, I would ask panel members, particularly ideas in addition to those already presented on modifying closed areas and/ or increasing access to the commercial hand-gear fishery for Swordfish.

If there are any other ideas please ponder them and be prepared to present them during the course of that discussion. So with that we'll move into rebuilding, and I believe we're going to start with Finetooth sharks. And Mike Clarke is going to present this. I think Shawn Dick had referred to him as our Sea Grant fellow, which was certainly the case last year now he is a federal employee with all the rights, responsibilities pertinent to that.

MR. CLARKE: Thanks very much Chris. I hope
I can live up to those expectations. As Chris
mentioned I'd like to give a brief presentation on
alternatives to reduce Finetooth shark fishing

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

mortality. First of all, starting of with just a little bit of life history or information about Finetooth sharks.

They are all -- they are part of these small coastal shark complex with Sharpnose Bonnethead and Blacknose sharks. They are -- inhabit shallow coastal waters between North Carolina and Texas. They generally are sexually mature at about four years; a little sooner for males than females; they pup in May and June, they feed primarily on mullet, spot, macro, Manhattan's(?) cephalopods and crustaceans, and they are in general attain a slightly larger size than other sharks in the small coastal complex with large females attaining lengths of up to 1.8 meters total length.

Just a little bit of background information about the fisheries; the current fisheries for Finetooth sharks. Approximately 80 percent of the commercial landings for Finetooth are landed with gillnet gear, and are in -- primarily in the South Atlantic.

Now, at the current time there is no directed trip limit for directed permit holders in the shark fishery; in the small coastal Shark fishery for Finetooth. For incidental permit holders, there is a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

16-fish limit, and that's combined with pelagics -- with pelagic sharks.

Currently, gillnets are banned in state waters in Texas, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and Louisiana. And Finetooth, compared to other small coastal and large coastal sharks are especially susceptible to gillnet gear and they have a tendency to roll upon contact with the gear. And based on observer reports a lot of Finetooth sharks are dead by the time that the gear is hauled back on board. Finetooth sharks exhibit one of the broadest selection curves also for gillnet mesh sizes.

Simply stated, this means that altering the mesh size that's allowable might not make a difference with regard to reducing Finetooth shark mortality in the commercial gillnet fisheries. Recreational fisheries between 2000 and 2003 based on -- based on MRFS data there was approximately 6700 Finetooth landed in the South Atlantic, slightly less; 5700 landed in the Gulf of Mexico.

And currently the regulation or the restriction is one fish per vessel per day, and it must be a minimum size of 54 inches. And based on the literature these fish are sexually mature at about 48-49 inches. So these fish when they're caught would've

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

had a chance to reproduce. The 2002 stock assessment that was conducted for small coastal Sharks found that the small coastal complex; Atlantic Sharpnose, Bonnethead, and Blacknose were not overfished, and no overfishing was occurring.

However, it did find that there was overfishing occurring for Finetooth sharks. Therefore, Magnuson-Steven acts -- Magnuson-Stevens act compels us to take measures to reduce fishing mortality for Finetooth sharks. Under the direct purview of HMS there is only five vessels that "target" Finetooth sharks and other small coastals with drill -- with gillnet gear.

These vessels are located out of several ports in eastern Florida and are subject to some of the most extensive observer coverage of any HMS fishery, a 100 percent during the Atlantic right whale calving period from November to March and approximately 30 to 50 percent outside of those periods.

And approximately, these five vessels in any given year and again, this depends on the presence or absence of Finetooth in federal waters. But in general these vessels only comprise about 10 percent of the landings; the five vessels that are directly

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

under HMS regulation.

However, the majority of Finetooth landings occur outside of HMS directly regulated fisheries. And there are approximately 18 vessels that land Finetooth and other sharks while they're targeting other fish, including Bluefish, croaker, whiting and Spanish mackerel.

This -- again, this is generally in the South Atlantic, off the coast of eastern Florida. These -- however these -- since these permit holders are -- these fishermen that are targeting other species, do possess a directed shark permit, and there is currently no trip limit for small coastals. These fishermen are able to land a good deal of Finetooth.

And actually -- again, depending on the year and the presence of Finetooth in federal waters could account for up to 90 percent of the Finetooth fishing mortality, and they are not subject to the extensive observer coverage that the five vessels regulated by HMS are.

There are other sources of mortality that might also be responsible for the -- these 2002 stock assessments stating that overfishing is occurring for Finetooth sharks. These include a gillnet fishery of mainly Mexican Panga vessels that fish in United

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

States waters from adjacent Mexican waters. And also Finetooth may occur as a by-catch in the shrimp trawl fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. And there might be other sources of mortality that we might not have identified yet at this time.

So, I just -- again, this is all in more detail in the pre-draft that you all have in front of you, but I just wanted to provide a real quick summary of alternatives that we may look at in order to reduce fishing mortality of Finetooth sharks. These could include additional measures, commercial measures, on the vessels that are under the direct management of HMS, those five vessels, fishing out of Eastern Florida, including a trip limit prohibiting landings of Finetooth sharks or possibly modifications to the gear.

Recreational measures might include increasing the minimum size for Finetooth, prohibiting landings or implementing the mandatory use of circle hooks, in order to increase post release mortality of Finetooth.

Or we could look outside of HMS and try and take action to get a handle on where -- it seems about 90 percent of the mortality is occurring. And this -- actions under this alternatives could include

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

increasing the observer coverage so that the directed shark permit holders that are now targeting other species with gillnet to be subject to observe a coverage to get an idea of what -- to what extent there are, or are not a great deal of Finetooth landings occurring.

It could include having Finetooth listed as a select species and subject to by-catch sub sampling in the shrimp trawl observer program in the gulf. Or they could include having Finetooth listed as a prohibited species for commercial and recreational fishermen.

So, what's next? Again, like I mentioned earlier, we are currently in 2005. John Carlson drift gillnet observer program out of Panama City, is looking at expanding the observer coverage to include vessels that are not currently being observed in the - off the coast of Eastern Florida, and might be targeting other fish like bluefish or croaker.

We might also coordinate with Jim Natts (phonetic) in Galveston, Texas, and have Finetooth listed as a select species so that there'll be sub samples of the by-catch and the shrimp trawl fishery in order to get a better handle on what sort of mortality is going on there, and also provide more

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

catch series data for the upcoming small coastal shark assessment in 2007.

And also we might look at having some bilateral meetings with officials in the Mexican government in order to maybe bring this issue of illegal fishing or encroachment by Mexican vessels, under control and get a better handle on reducing mortality to that end.

But with that, I look forward to any questions or comments that you might have. And that's all I have for now.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Mark. Just to reiterate that. Because it wasn't apparent in this slide, but Mike had mentioned it now that Mexican incursions are not authorized, and we have been working with the Coast Guard to characterize that, and try to work on that information to get more information that we can work into the stock assessment to get a handle on the potential impacts of that illegal fishery in -- the impacts of that illegal fishery on the populations who are particularly of small coastals.

And again see how that would work its way through on the stock assessment. But with that I'm trying to recall, I think, I said I would start with

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Several

the head table, the other head of the table here --SPEAKER: Points of, well, clarification, then again --MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right. So for the first round, we'll ask for points of clarification and then we'll get into comments. Any hands for points of clarification? I got both sides and I said, I'd start in the middle and --SPEAKER: It's going to be an education, let me, go -- just go through -- it's going to work in --10 11 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: points of clarifications. Let's just take the 12 13 comments and just --SPEAKER: Just do it. 14 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Russ Nelson. 15 MR. NELSON: It seems to me, you got a 16 pretty simple solution here. You've got gillnet 17 fisheries operating out of Florida that -- the gear is 18 19 20 21

illegal in Florida, it's illegal in Georgia, it's illegal in South Carolina. The South Atlantic Council has repeatedly asked this group and your office to prohibit this gear in that fishery. It's got a large by-catch of other finfish, and it seems to be pretty simple. Just get --

prohibit that gear, you eliminate the Finetooth

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

22

23

24

overfishing problem and you significantly reduce a lot of other finfish by-catch.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thanks for the comment. But just to clarify what Mike had presented is those five gillnet vessels that routinely target small coastals are only accounting for about 10 percent of the landings of Finetooth. If we were to prohibit it, I presume that the by-catch in the non small coastal directed gillnet fisheries would still encounter Finetooth, and it would just convert from landings to dead discards. So --

SPEAKER: Well, I would --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Again, that's an option we can consider, but just to recognize the magnitude of the impact in prohibiting it may not be as much as it might appear at the surface.

SPEAKER: Well, I think that you should coordinate action then with the South Atlantic council to prohibit the other drift gillnet gear, the other gillnet gear out there. And between your office and the South Atlantic council, you can solve the problem.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. All right, Ellen Peel.

MS. PEEL: On your chart here, on page 256, it shows the by-catch in the fishery, it shows 30

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

0.13 to 1.5.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

209 MR. DANIEL: For F/FMSY? MR. DICK: Yes. SPEAKER: What's the range again? MR. DICK: I'm sorry. SPEAKER: What's the range again? MR. DICK: 0.13 to 1.5. MR. DANIEL: So what's the median? I mean, that's under utilized to slightly overfished? 8 MR. DICK: Yes. MR. DANIEL: So what's the -- so, are you 10 11 taking -- just taking the extreme end of the range to say that they are overfishing? What's the mean? 12 MR. DICK: The -- I mean, the people I 13 conducted the assessment -- Enrique, I mean, they 14 claimed that overfishing was occurring and because of 15 -- I think it was just an -- you know, they wanted to 16 make a conservative assessment, in order to reduce 17 fishing mortality. 18 MR. DANIEL: But you can't do that. 19 You can't --20 SPEAKER: You can do that. 21 MR. DANIEL: No, no, you can't do that, 22 because you don't now have any idea what stock status 23 is if it's -- the range is 0.13 to 1.5 over -- on the 24 F/FMSY, and you are not overfished. I mean, it makes 25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

sense looking at the data that they're not overfished.

And so it's confounding to me how if the stock status looks great.

If you take the first 50 percent of the data points -- I mean who made this conclusion that they're overfishing and was it peer reviewed and we need to know what the mean is -- and the 95 percent confidence (phonetic) that was around that mean before we can make recommendations on reducing overfishing when we -- I'm certainly not convinced that we're overfishing.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right.

Just a point of clarification. The stock is not overfished in the small coastal assessment, but overfishing was occurring, so --

MR. DANIEL: That's not true. The range is 0.13 to 1.5, with no 95 percent confidence and no mean. So, you can't say they're overfishing.

MR. DICK: Okay.

MR. DANIEL: In my opinion. I don't know how you could do that, when there is statistics looks like there is just as much likelihood that you could be under utilized as overfishing. So, how do you make the determination that you're overfishing?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I don't have the small coastal shark stock assessment in front of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

me, but perhaps during the break we can go through that, but, clearly the stock assessment did identify it as overfishing is occurring. And we'll have to -- a follow up discussion on the technicalities therein, and certainly a range was reported, and that was interpreted conservatively with respect to overfishing is occurring. But again, we'll get a copy of the small coastal assessment, and hopefully, can address your concern during the break. Any further comments on the -- left side here. Ken -- oh, Henry Ansley.

MR. ANSLEY: Yes, I just want to know -first of all, one comment. I was talking about -- I
was looking at the landings, recreational landings
under the MRFS survey and --

(Tape interruption)

MR. HUDSON: Suggest that if you wanted to do a time closure just to be able to give those animals a chance to dump their pups at the last trimester of their pregnancy, then, you know, in April, May, June, will potentially be useful. I'm not certain if these animals segregate much by size. People like Glenn Ulrich or something that has done little bit of study on that can maybe give an idea, but several people feel like it's a very healthy stock. And because your science is having to work

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

with very limited inputs I'd be saying that you might be rushing to do too much.

So I would caution against that. If the idea is that you want to eliminate certain gear types, because down in Florida you just don't like them being there, offer Georgia; make them one offer. That's an idea that has been around for a while with the whale team, the bottlenose dolphin team, and even some of them are becoming more engendered to it, because they feel burdened by this 100 percent observer coverage for the five boats, and they also feel burdened by sometimes waltzing up and being the source of lot of criticism in case they have something like a big strike or something.

And you can't just bring all those stuff in because you are going to have that problem possibly happen, like with the Blacktips happened with the gillnet, because they have a 4000 pound trip limit. If you do put a trip limit on there, kindly consider what those landings are.

Look at those 18 boats that are fishing for croaker and whatever, because a lot of time there are very smaller boat only have X amount of capacity and you want to see just how much they're responsible for them. We need those kind of numbers to make, I

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

believe, an intelligent decision. But like I say, without the by-catch numbers folded into the modeling you're kind of backing up here. You need to get that all corrected.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Rusty. Randy Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Thank you. On page 62, the last sentence is easy to misunderstand, and it reads, "Currently gillnets are banned in most state waters." And then there is a parenthesis to point six, well, "The three nautical miles except Texas and the west coast of Florida," et cetera, et cetera. It's easy to understand that to say that gillnets are banned except in Texas. So -- and you've written that right. It just --it's easy to misread it so we might take a look at the structure of that sentence?

Two other things. I want to, from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department standpoint, offer our assistance to facilitate the cooperation between the Coast Guard in South Padre and the Texas Game Wardens, which are part of our agency, to collect the biological information from sharks and confiscated gillnets. I'm down there in that area, so, you know, I'll give you a hand as best I can to help make that happen.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Also I want to express our interest in the bilateral meetings with the Mexican Government, if those happen, to address the issue of illegal gillnetting in the U.S. and Texas waters, because it is related to this illegal activity in Texas waters in addition to the EEZ, and also in the lower Rio Grande extreme portion where there's gillnetting taking place there too. I think you're also going to find that it's illegal to gillnet in Mexico, but there're no enforcements, so -- thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Randy; we'll keep that in mind. I know that the U.S.-Mexico bilateral was rescheduled; I'm not exactly sure if I recall whether it's going to occur in May or June, but we'll find that out and see if it's available for a representative from Texas Parks and Wildlife to participate or at least we'll work with you before the bilateral to get your concerns addressed. Anyone else on the right side. Sonja?

MS. FORDHAM: Yes, I'm always on the right side, that's where I want to sit. Yes, have we moved off questions and now are into comments, because I did have some -- I have both. I'm trying to follow the rules.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We took them

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

really nice, but I'm really troubled, as you know,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

from last week about this, and the lack of shark actions in the pre-draft. I think overall my concerns boil down to the -- the wording here is very squishy -- this always happens to me, I'll wait. I'm just waiting for the staff to pay attention. All right, I'll just go ahead.

SPEAKER: Yes, just to clarify, the observer program for the shrimp fishery in the Gulf is already in place, and we have just spoken with the people that run that program, and they seem interested in adding Finetooth to their select list so that when they do sub samples, a by-catch Finetooth would be included to get a -- because right now it's just shark. If they get a shark, it's just shark, and then toss it over or whatever. And so now we're going to have, you know, additional by-catch data that was missing in the 2002 assessment.

MS. FORDHAM: Okay.

SPEAKER: So I hope that makes that more clear.

MS. FORDHAM: That's -- yes, that does. As I was saying I think the wording is very squishy, and a lot of the actions are long overdue, which brings us to this problem that we have now where all these questions and all this confusion and Finetooth sharks

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are going to suffer, and this assessment was done in 2002, and it looks like a lot of these questions, a lot of the things we could've done to approach other sources of mortality could've been taken care of.

And now we're down to the wire and there is -- there are a lot of hints that you might want to delay action on Finetooth till after the next assessment. And I just think a lot of this could've been done beforehand. As you know I'm troubled that this -- throughout this document this section, it says, we're going to reduce fishing mortality or address overfishing or prevent further overfishing. And the requirement is to stop or to end overfishing.

I think, as I've said before, this is heavy on collecting more information, and sort of shifting the blame and light on the proposed action. So we support action now in this round for this species. The -- developing the sop(phonetic) time proposals et cetera. And there has been, as you know, a lot of attention from this AP to those five vessels which have serious by-catch problems overall. So I hope there's some options in the draft for that. I don't know if you've approached the councils, but these other sources of mortality seem to be mostly Atlantic

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

councils. And have you approached them, have you asked -- made any attempts to get the councils to deal with Finetooth by-catch and those -- the croaker plan; the blue fish plan?

SPEAKER: Not yet.

Ms. FORDHAM: Okay. I hope we could do that. Again, that shouldn't have to wait for an amendment. Just a little cooperation with the councils. I do strongly support a bilateral with Mexico that deals with this shark issue, but I would hope that you would not just say, "Stop taking sharks from our waters but manage sharks in your own," and there are a lot of sharks that travel across the boundary and the Mexican shark plan has been festering for too many years now.

So I'm hoping you'll use that opportunity to put pressure on Mexico to conserve sharks. Overall, I think a lot of this frustration deals with the other pressing issues that we've talked about for years and years with sharks, and Dewey and Rusty have already them up. Already at this meeting there is no formal time to talk about them, but the species-specific data collection and the problems with data collection with sharks, we really need to address that along with the state cooperation.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And I'm just a broken record on this and there's no opportunity on this agenda and no real actions under that pre-draft that address these. But these are really important problems that have led us to this specific problem that we have here. And I just hope later before the meeting is over that we have a chance to talk about preventing overfishing and stopping overfishing and rebuilding a number of other sharks or protecting particularly vulnerable species like the deepwater sharks. We put these in our comments several times, and there's no opportunity so far in the agenda. So I hope you'll make time later in the meeting. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you Sonja. Bob Hueter and then Ken Hinman.

MR. HUETER: Well, you're not going to hear me say that every Finetooth shark counts. Every individual Finetooth shark counts. Just so you know that I was serious about what I said about Sawfish. But this is a very interesting guy. This is a small species of shark and it's got a very patchy distribution throughout the southeast U.S. And in some localized areas like where Glenn works in South Carolina, it's almost common at certain times of the year. But throughout most of its range it's very

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

uncommon.

So it's a species that's in many ways vulnerable to overfishing where overfishing could put it quickly into a highly depleted state. So the -- you know, the concerns are justified. A couple of comments in response to what people said. Randy; as far as Mexico I completely agree with him. The Mexico problem is much more than a Finetooth shark problem. We have a Blacktip sharp problem; a serious Blacktip shark problem in terms of not having the data didn't know the catches, the removals that the Mexican are responsible for in.

By the way for your document, Panga, it's spelled P-A-N-G-A, I believe, not P-O, although it sounds like pongo in the anglicized version. So we need to get -- we need to get that fixed; that would help with the assessment of all these species. On Louis' question about the stock assessment for Finetooth sharks on page 173 is the table for fishing mortality rates and the rate was estimated for 2000 is 0.13 to 1.5. And that -- you compare that to the maximum fishing mortality rate that's theorized at 0.03 to 0.44. There is some overlap, but it's not huge; it's about a one-third overlap.

So based on that, those findings, the two

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

independent assessments that were done that Randy mentioned, the one by Enrique Cortes (phonetic) in the southeast center and one by Collin Simphendor, (phonetic), both concluded that overfishing occurring on this species, and that those were independent. Then what Dewey said about identification of species, I completely agree with. And I would ask the question in that 80 percent fishery, that mixed fishery that's responsible for 80 percent of the landings, who's doing the identifying in that case? Because I know who is doing the identifying in the shark gill-net fishery. Those are observers that are trained by shark people: John Carlson, and his group at Panama City. So I have a lot of confidence in that -- those Ids, but I'm not sure I have a lot of confidence in the IDs in these other fisheries. Can you answer that?

SPEAKER: It's the dealers, general canvas.

MR. HUETER: The dealers? Well, good luck, because most biologists and I -- most ichthyologists can't tell a Finetooth shark from other species of sharks. So I would question the base of the -- the basis of that -- those data and wonder if it's really, you know, a 90/10 or, whatever it is, 80/20 split. My last question is to the NMFS staff. Somebody must

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

know this by now: what is the annual cost of the observer program for these five boats in the shark gill-net fishery? They have to be observed a 100 percent of the time during the right whale calving season, and a 35 to 50 percent of the time approximately the rest of the year. How much is NMFS spending in this observer program at this point?

SPEAKER: I believe, it has ranged between about a \$150,000 to close to a \$300,000.

MR. HUETER: That's per year?

SPEAKER: Per year.

MR. HUETER: And we've had to do that for how many years now? Three to four years?

SPEAKER: Since their critical habitat was identified for the right whales probably about five years now, I guess; that we've had that level of coverage. A 100 percent during the calving season and 50 percent in other times.

MR. HUETER: And obviously that's something that you have to do. This is not mismanagement of funds. That's something that you are required to do because of the situation with the fishery. For Pete's sake we could've used that money to buy out this —these five boats a long time ago. I mean, I know I sound like a broken record on this; every year I bring

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

this up, but for the reasons of by-catch issues, now for Finetooth shark overfishing, and this cost of observer programs let's please get rid of this fishery.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, Ken Hinman, I believe, is next, and then Louis Daniel.

MR. HINMAN: Yes, I just want to follow up on something that Sonja brought up as far as cooperation with the councils on this. And I understand that NMFS made the designation overfishing is occurring for Finetooth shark, and instructed its HMS division to take the appropriate action under the FMP. But if it is not now your policy to inform councils that are responsible for managing the fisheries that are identified to be responsible for the majority of mortality, if it's not already your policy to inform them that overfishing is occurring and ask them to take appropriate action also, I recommend that it should be.

It seemed like that's a big flaw in the system if the identification is only related to be responsible manager for the species, and asking them to take appropriate action when it's taken incidentally in other fisheries that are managed by other management bodies, and they don't get that same

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

directive that this has been identified and that they should take appropriate action as well.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks. We obviously do work with the councils not only through the advisory panel but through consultations with the councils. But perhaps we do need to formalize the procedure with the direct communication on very specific issues. Any -- oh, Louis Daniel, next?

MR. DANIEL: Yes, and thanks Bob for pointing out that table. And if would you look at --back at that page 173, I think there's some important information there that everyone needs to recognize, and perhaps give some discussion on at some point. When I asked what was the ratio of FMSY, the range given was 0.13 to 1.5. That was actually the current F in 2000. So the terminal year of the assessment is 2000. But as Bob pointed out, and he is correct, there are significant overlap between the ranges of F and the ranges of FMSY.

So there are many different iterations there where you could be in a situation where you are not overfishing. Now, if they concluded that they were overfishing, cool, all right, I can't argue with that right now. But the point is that what level of overfishing are you talking about? If your current F

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is 0.3, and FMSY is 0.25, that translates into a certain percent reduction, in order to end overfishing. If your current F is 0.8 and your FMSY is 0.3, that's a significantly higher reduction, all right.

And so we don't know at this particular moment what level of overfishing is occurring. And it might be that the 10 percent from the gillnet fleet takes care of your overfishing problem. And you buy them out, you get rid of them, if that's what the desire of everybody is, then you end overfishing. It may be that that won't do it; and maybe you need to have the whole fishery closed down. I don't know because you can't tell. And it's very concerning to me that these ranges are so significant in -- particularly for Finetooth.

That suggests to me that there is a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the result of this assessment, because if you look at the terminal F for all the other species, it's a fairly tight range. Whereas with Finetooth sharks you're ranging from around the 12 percent annual exploitation rate there to probably in the 75 to 80 percent range, which is a huge, this, you know, range there.

So that really would give me a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

concern if I were being regulated based on these numbers, because of the real severe ranges here. But we need to know the best estimate -- the best point estimate of FMSY, and the best point estimate of F current in order to determine what percent reduction you need.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks, Louis. Well, we'll certainly make sure that the next opportunity we'll try to be a little bit more specific or get those parties involved in the stock assessment to be more specific in picking their maximum likelihood perhaps for the point estimates, and see if we can do that quantitative assessment of the level of overfishing.

And obviously, you're correct insofar as if that quantitative estimate is, we have a slight problem of overfishing, then we need a slight remedy, if it's a major problem we need a major remedy. So I think I had -- Dick Stone, then Randy and then Henry.

MR. STONE: Chris, just a quick comment. I want to support what others have said before, the need for species-specific data.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Randy?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Related to the Shrimp

Trawl Fishery Observer Program, you said that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Finetooth would be added. I'd also say if at all possible if they could do all species identification on that it would be advantageous, because stock assessments change and the needs now may be quite different than what they may be, you know, in 2 years or 5 years or 10 years. And if you've got that observer information to species on the sharks -- on the shrimp trawl by-catch, that could be real advantageous. I don't know if that's feasible, but it's something to think about.

And I know that Bob Hueter was probably exaggerating when he said that ichthyologists couldn't identify Finetooth. But I think, you know, it's not that hard. You have to be careful but it's not that difficult.

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Randy. Henry \\$ and then Nelson.

MR. ANSLEY: Thank you. I just -- talking about the trawl catch, there -- if we got -- at least Georgia did, I suspect almost every state has done by-catch studies. We did identify two of the species. Our people were trained; maybe NMFS trained them or coast guard, one or the other, to the species. And of course they're yet to consider the fact that the TEDs went in, which helped considerably. But -- well, I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

was trying to figure out, well, where is the mortality coming from, because it looks -- in the map, it puts Georgia right in the Essential Fish Habitat.

And we were looking at it, and, in our bycatch study, you know, a 177 turtles is fishery
dependent. Dating back to 1995, there's been three
Finetooth caught in the trawl industry, you know, or
at least in that study. Now, whether that's because
of the TEDs or what, they do catch, I believe, a lot
of Atlantic sharp nose pups because that's obviously - there are obviously pups there. But Finetooth,
again on the MRFS in Georgia, those three years that
they reported, that are being based on -- the PSE is a
100.

And it's -- from 2000 to 2003, actually, the estimates are based on actually three fish that were actually measured by our field clerks and we run it -- we run the MRFS in our states so they're well trained. So we are trying to figure out, well, where does this come from, and we are right in the middle of the Essential Fish Habitat. We have a coast bed training and they're not picking up too many Finetooth. We get them, but the trawl industry, apparently -- we also have an ongoing trawl monitoring that we've done. And they've seen very few Finetooth in their net and they

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

don't have birds in their -- I mean, not birds, but TEDs in theirs. So I'm not sure of it, but I would think that this trawl by-catch studies would be available in most states, and ought to be able to give you an idea. Now, whether they went to species-specific, I'm not sure, but some of them may have. So I'm saying, look at those. Also the other thing is add to that table about season and then species, as far -- Finetooth and the size. If you -- I don't know if there is any area 10 11 breakdowns might help, where these catches are coming from -- from the commercial industry, I guess. 12 Just be South Atlantic or the 13 SPEAKER: Gulf. 14 MR. ANSLEY: Just that general. Okay, so 15 there's no specific areas as far as --16 SPEAKER: Well, if I -- yes, I could look at 17 the actual logbooks and get the actual region for the 18 -- from the South Atlantic --19 MR. ANSLEY: Right. I think --20 SPEAKER: From the General canvas --21 MR. ANSLEY: Right. I think as much as you 22 23

could break it down would help. And also on the MRFS data present -- when you present that, make sure you present the standard errors and stuff like that,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

24

because you need to look at these to see what it is being based on. And the other thing I would say for us is that Georgia actually would like to get rid of driftnet vessels also.

And I think that's pretty much said, I think I'd be remiss or I might be fired if I didn't say that it came here. We had another encounter with them of the worst kind, I guess, in state waters this past year. We seized another gillnet vessel and went to court with it and so forth. But, yes, we would be real pleased if something was done about them. That's it.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. And if you need a copy of the tape for the record that you said it, well, we'll get you a copy. We have Nelson, and I think that was it. Maybe we could take a break after Nelson.

MR. BEIDEMAN: Yes, Chris. In proportion to their fishing mortality responsibilities, that's the intended law. Whether they're recreational or commercial, gillnet or hook and line or hug the fish to death or whatever they do, we can't just go after them, because we don't like them. In proportion to fishing — their fishing mortality responsibilities.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Nelson. At this point we'll take a break, and then we'll come into reducing overfishing; fishing mortality for billfish. Be back in 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken)

MR. NELSON: Into the goals of this portion of the rulemaking. And those include the, obviously, the poor stock status and the high fishing mortality rate that we just reviewed. A sort of recent addition to this area is some relatively new information that shows that post-release mortality rates of White Marlin released on circle hooks may be higher than previously thought. John Graves.

MR. GRAVES: J-hooks.

MR. NELSON: J-hooks. Did I say circle? Sorry, J-hooks. It's approximately 35 percent and that is a sort of a new piece of the equation to be factored in the future. Also factoring into the entire rulemaking here obviously, is the domestic implementation of ICCAT, 250 marlin landing limit, which has been on the table for a few years, a need to improve the recreational data, which has being discussed here already, and as I mentioned, the pending ESA listing review.

The goals, it include reducing fishing mortality. I guess, that should say, "And/or

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

landings," as appropriate and improving billfish monitoring and reporting. So to jump into -- well, I guess just before I actually get into the first one, I guess, the alternatives can really be loosely categorized in three -- into three categories: gear restrictions, landings restrictions, and data collection. So the first, obviously, is the no-action alternative and the numbers of these correspond to the numbers in the pro/con table in chapter 2 of your document.

So number one here is number one under the billfish list of alternatives in the pro/con section of your document. Two -- I think it's 2.3.3 in your big document. And in that pro/con there is obviously a much more detailed discussion of the pros and cons of each of these potential draft alternatives. So noaction, obviously, no changes in the management measures. And this has -- would have no anticipated short-time adverse socio-economic impacts, but it does risk future implementation of potentially, significantly more stringent management measures, if stock status either doesn't improve or continues to decline. And obviously we'll have to wait till -- I think it's at this point, 2006, to see the next stocks assessment.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So moving into gear alternatives or the -number two is -- I guess the easiest way to start this off is to say, when using natural baits or artificial lure/natural bait combinations, there would be mandatory use, under this alternative, mandatory use of circle hooks on vessels with angling permits, on charter/head boat permitted vessels on for hire trips, and general category permitted on vessels participating in tournaments.

The intent of that alternative would be to capture all facets of HMS recreational angling any time natural baits were being used. Obviously, you can see the pro/cons in the table there. One of the problems with this is that it doesn't necessarily target or hit on the target fishery here within the billfish section, which is the billfish fishery. The third alternative is with -- again, when using natural baits and/or artificial lure, natural bait combination, would be mandatory use of circle hooks for all billfish tournament participants.

And this -- one of the benefits here is to focus mortality reductions on the target fishery. And again, that is only when you are using natural bait. So you would be able to go fishing for HMS with artificial lures with J-hooks. But if there is any

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

natural component to the terminal rig, then it would have to be a circle hook.

Moving to sort of the landings restrictions category, some tried and true pieces increase the minimum legal size limit for white or Blue Marlin. This could continue the fishery to allow with minimal disruption. But given the limited landings that occur, it may have limited а conservation or mortality benefit. If we're landing as few as we're reporting to ICCAT, then reducing by a handful of fish isn't going to turn the population around.

Fifth is to implement a recreational bag limit of one Atlantic billfish per vessel per trip. Again, this may have a limited conservation or mortality benefit and may have some adverse impacts on certain segments of the fishery. Obviously, charter vessels, it may complicate some trips. Alternative six is to codify the ICCAT 250 marlin recreational landings limit. This would include carryover provisions. Again, if you recall recommendation 0014, it mandates carryover of overages, but it allows carryover of underages, so there -- this does not guarantee that we would carry over underages.

It also would include in-season adjustment

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of minimum sizes, possession limits or any other measures, as necessary to make sure we comply with the 250 fish limit. You can see some of the more obvious pros and cons. It would help us comply with ICCAT recommendations. It gives the agency a little bit of flexibility, in terms of trying to ensure compliance. But it has potential disadvantages in terms of late season tournaments, if we begin to approach that 250 fish limit on a regular basis.

Now, one complicating factor there is, I don't -- when we get to it, the potential switch to the calendar year from fishing year, that last bullet, obviously, the term late season would shift from what wouldn't, under current regulations, be spring to summer. So there would be a shift in terms of the geography that is impacted by potential restrictions.

Billfish landing restrictions continued potentially prohibit non-tournament landings of Atlantic White Marlin. Obviously, this would allow only catch and release fishing outside of registered tournaments. It would be difficult to impact -- to gauge the impact of this given the uncertainty that surrounds non-tournament landings and obviously may have some adverse socio-economic impacts.

Alternative eight is to prohibit

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

tournament landings of Atlantic White Marlin. This would allow catch and release format tournaments to continue. It would eliminate the largest verifiable source of directed White Marlin effort at this time. It obviously may adversely impact some tournaments, and would -- could decrease available catching effort data, although you can still report catching effort data from catch and release fishing.

Billfish landing restrictions, the final one would be a prohibition on possession of all -- prohibit all possession, retention, and landings of Atlantic blue and White Marlin. Obviously, this would allow only catch and release. It would potentially have adverse impacts on tournaments and CHP operators. It would likely facilitate compliance with ICCAT -- the ICCAT landings limit. It would likely decrease available data, but it would be relatively easy to enforce.

Moving into the recreational billfish data collection issues, they're all on one page here. No-action would continue the current tournament registration and reporting system, in a nutshell. You're supposed to register tournaments four weeks in advance of the commencement of a tournament. And you're supposed to report, if selected, within seven

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

days of the closure or endpoint of the tournament, if you're selected.

Number two would require -- would have a very subtle shift in the regulations that, I think, could help clarify some confusion out there which would be currently the regulations say that you must notify NMFS of a tournament. This would change the regulations to the fact that you would have to register with HMS specifically, so it would eliminate confusion. A number of people have called the Southeast Fishery Science Center; there's been some confusion about what's registered and what's not.

It would also mean that tournament operators would have to be in receipt of a conformation number to have that registration process complete. And that concept comes from the callback system, which is in place for those of you who have used it. Your registration is not complete until you get that number from our office.

Third would be to potentially implement a tournament permit requirement and that would give us a little bit more enforcement power, if the tournaments were not registering or reporting as per regulations.

And finally, the forth would -- is another sort of subtle shift which would change the current

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

reporting from -- for billfish tournaments from "if selected" to just "mandatory" for all tournaments. And that's more for a certain internal issue. It will help our recordkeeping and ease our administrative burden. The fact is right now, as a policy, the agency selects all billfish, so there won't be any real change for the angling community. The only difference would be you won't get a letter every time 9 saying you need to report. You -- there is just a blanket obligation of billfish tournaments to report 10 11 within seven days. And with that I will open it up for comments and questions? 12 13 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Russ. Why don't we start on this side of the table? 14 Jim Donofrio. 15 MR. DONOFRIO: Just have a question, Russ, 16 on the mortality sheet there. Can you back to that, 17 the first one there? 18 MR. NELSON: Yes. 19

MR. DONOFRIO: That 40, where is that derived from, that number?

MR. NELSON: Which one?

MR. DONOFRIO: On the right, on the top here. The White Marlin, yeah, the White Marlin one.

MR. NELSON: The White Marlin.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

20

21

22

23

24

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

MR. DONOFRIO: I'm not going anywhere. MR. NELSON: It is derived from the various fisheries for Blue Marlin or White Marlin. MR. DONOFRIO: Okay. And regarding the --I guess you want some comments on these proposals here. SPEAKER: As in --MR. NELSON: Also, not just proposals but 9 if you examine the pro/con --MR. DONOFRIO: Yeah, I did -- I looked at 10 11 it. MR. NELSON: That stuff and --12 13 MR. DONOFRIO: I don't know, from my perspective, I looked at them. I don't think I can 14 choose any one of them. I mean, I can see there's 15 different segments of each section in an area. 16 17 could take a little bit of each and come up with something to -- come up with a better way of managing 18 billfish and not just pick one. As far as the 250 19 fish, I wouldn't want to see us memorialize a bad 20 deal. Our partners on the other side of the pond 21 never lived up to it. 22 So, you know, I don't want to memorialize 23

So, you know, I don't want to memorialize that and get it into our regulations here. But I think there is a combination of things that we can

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

24

come up with collectively here from all those sections here that we read, and I can't say what they are right now. But just to pick one, I think, just isolates us, and you're going to see some comments from our, you know, organization anyway. But I want to be firm about the 250 fish. I know it's going to expire soon at ICCAT and we should let that expire. And I'm not saying that we should not address everything we can possibly do to reduce mortality.

One of the other concerns I have is, have we really defined what a circle look is. I mean I fish with them; I particularly like them now. Problem is there is so many different brands they call circle hooks. And, you know, what is a circle hook, which one is a real circle hook? You know, they all get different makes. I mean, you know, before we go forward saying we have mandatory circle hooks.

Well, you know, we got to consider that, we have to define them, and then I think you have to give the industry, and these are tackle stores et cetera, time to phase out of their stock of J-hooks. I mean, you know, you can't just say, "Go mandatory right away," until you define them, number one, and then you have some time to phase out of their stock of hooks that are in their stores. So that's some of my

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

concerns here. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: If National Marine Fisheries chooses to go with the circle hook for the recreational, I think that's going to help reduce mortality. I would go along with Jim of letting them phase it out. We didn't have opportunity -- or let them phase out the J-hook so that they won't have large sources of J-hooks in their stocks. Because us, in the pelagic Longline industry, we weren't given that chance. Probably, got about a \$1000 worth of hooks, at first we used those in trying to send them to another country. But hadn't got them in the mail yet.

When you look at these, the landings for the billfish, the 250 number, National Marine Fisheries should do everything in its power to look at -- that you don't get yourself in this predicament again, as far as a arbitrary and capricious number. Because it's like you've had to define your universe based on these 250 fish, and you have to look at all sources of mortality. I've read some reports about the circle hooks in other countries, that the recreational use and that looks promising. But it just -- I don't know if the recreational industry is yet ready to address that in the U.S. And that's my comments, thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Dick Stone.

MR. STONE: Yes, Chris. Obviously, as Jim said, I will be submitting some comments for the National Marine Manufacturers Association, but just will make a few general comments. And, one, data collection obviously is still a concern, as I have expressed before. And I think here it certainly shows that we wouldn't have been in the bind we're in now, if we'd had good data collection for this fishery over the years. So I'll just reiterate what I've said before. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Rick Weber?

MR. WEBER: Russ, a couple of tournament issues first. In the safe report, we've got -- you've got claims that there are 300 to 400, and you referred to them as tournaments based on an Internet search. The page before, you define what a tournament is. Has there been any analysis to determine that those 300 to 400 events are actually tournaments as defined by NMFS? Or is the -- or do we just know of 300 or 400 events because you've got a definition you need to be within. I didn't do the Internet search but, I guess, if -- can you define for me what you mean by event as opposed to a tournament? That might help the answer. I mean for us a tournament, as you can see, it's, you

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know, anything with an award category or awards, points or prizes for an Atlantic HMS that occurs from an Atlantic coast port. So what would be an event that is not a tournament?

MR. NELSON: I'm thinking of the annual type club tournaments, you know. I mean, I -- there I won't use the word, but it's really more of a logging of who caught what, you know. You may not need to register for it. It may be that all club members are automatically in it. I'm just giving -- I'm being overly picayune only because you are -- I'm afraid of being portrayed as my industry being out of compliance, you know. When you say that there are 300 to 400 tournaments and then follow it with, but only 200 of them are registered, you are implicitly saying half of the tournaments just won't comply with us.

Perhaps, and perhaps, the 300 to 400 number is not accurate. And if you have that list -- if someone has that list, have we done things to specifically address those people who are not in compliance? I mean, it seems almost like you're setting a trap to say, "I know who these people are that are holding events. But they're not registered."

MR. RUAIS: There have been a number of efforts. We've undertaken a lot of efforts to get

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

compliance. They include efforts -- outreach efforts from the agency which range from articles in magazines to distribution of 62,000 brochures to calls and fax notices, letters, as well as efforts from enforcement when -- who will identify tournaments on their own or at the request of another portion of the agency, whether it be HMS or the science center to find tournaments that have not complied.

MR. NELSON: All right. I'm -- like I said, it's more of a perception thing within the agency that I don't want my industry being perceived as avoiding compliance. You also said earlier, you know, in a private discussion that you've got some constraints now that won't let you pursue particular events that do not renew. If that's true, I'd hope that there would be some type of standardized way that we could -- if you can't pursue a particular event because of legal constraints, perhaps a little more reminder or something like that that is done to a broad base that wouldn't violate your constraints.

MR. RUAIS: And if you have any suggestions on how -- and this goes to everyone on all issues, not just tournament issue. But we are always looking for ways to improve our communication with all sectors and communities, and we're often criticized for not doing

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

enough to communicate with folks. And, frankly, a lot of times we've done what we can reasonably do within whatever restraints we're given, and we're just either out of ideas or out of the ability to do something else. But if you all have ideas on how to better communicate, whether to use you all as a conduit or whatever it is, please let us know.

SPEAKER: All right. Not long there after, I see here that we're now registering tournaments in the Bahamas, Turks and Caicos, and Mexico. What is happening with the landings from those events? You — if you allow them involuntarily, what is happening to their catch reports?

MR. NELSON: You have to talk to the science center. They're the ones who track those. We will register them, if they come to us, primarily. They will register with us, if they are really full of U.S. fishers. And a U.S. -- a fish caught on a U.S. boat is a U.S. fish, landed -- even in a foreign country, is a U.S. fish. How the science center incorporates those landings, I am not 100 percent sure whether we can find out.

MR. RUAIS: I'm just more interested in making sure that we're excluding the non-U.S. boat data. If there is non-U.S. boat data because it is a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

foreign tournament, we need to exclude those data in these days when we're counting each fish. Going back Hueter, each fish is important. Regarding the landing restrictions, size restrictions, those type things, recreational fishermen are optimists. I've said it before each time we discussed a size limit versus a bag limit.

Tell a recreational fisherman, "You can catch all you want, but they got to be this big." They're going to think they're going to catch it and they will continue to fish. Tell the same person you could only catch one, it decreases the optimism and in truth, that's what those of us in the recreational industry sell, is optimism. You know, the people don't have to catch so much as believe they're going to catch. So I will always take a size limit over a bag limit. Regarding the separation of a non-tournament caught fish versus a tournament fish, either seven or eight, I'd be opposed to both of them. I think it leads to more in-house division.

I've always maintained that a tournament fisherman is just a recreational -- a bunch of recreational fishermen who decided to do the same thing on the same day, and I want to neither penalize them or give them special privileges for doing so. I

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

always thought the registration and permitting of the tournaments had more to do with -- it was an easy place for NMFS to get data. And speaking for our own, we were more than happy to comply. But I wasn't looking to make our fishermen, as I say, advantaged nor disadvantaged.

The final thing I have, when Mike was up earlier, he said that his interpretation of Magnuson is that it requires the agency to reduce mortality of all species identified as over-fished. It does not discuss landings. In your slides, you have said you want to reduce mortality and/or landings. If we've got the 250 number to deal with, that's one thing. If we're not talking about the 250 number, there is no reason to get involved with the landings at all. Going further down the mortality, obviously there are multiple sources of mortality, regardless of landings. Nelson, you fed me such bait, I can't not pick it up.

In proportion -- things are to be reduced in proportion to their fishing mortality responsibilities, it was the last thing you said. My only request is, when we start talking about reductions -- and perhaps the circle hooks are sufficient. You've gone to circle; we move to circle, everybody is reducing mortality. I just -- we both

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Thank you

are to do -- you need to make sure that you're chasing all sources of mortality, when you do this. finally, that would go back to point number 13, which everyone in the recreational fishing industry was going, no, you can't get rid of goal 14 and 13. Thank you. MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Rick. Pam Basco. MS. BASCO: Getting back to compliance for registered tournaments; so do we have a definitive answer on what constitutes the tournament as opposed to say a club contest that goes year long? MR. NELSON: Well, I'd say there is a

well-defined definition of a tournament and if the club event fits that definition, then it would have to be registered. And there are some that are -- there are a number in the database of --

SPEAKER: Rodeos.

NELSON: Rodeos MR. yearlong tournaments by a club, which is sort of the impression of -- I get of what you two are talking about, which have registered with us. And that goes say from, I don't know, April through November or that sort of thing. Yeah.

MS. BASCO: Well, as for instance Houston

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Big Game Fishing Club. We have a organized tournament, you pay a tournament fee. It's a weekend tournament. But we have also included in your dues a yearlong contest, where wherever you're fishing, you catch and release, or catch a fish, you turn in an affidavit. There is no registration fee for it. It's just a yearlong event. Would that be considered a tournament, as well? And a ton of other clubs along the Gulf Coast have those same type of events?

MR. NELSON: I have to look at the exact language and the definition. I don't know if, you know, offhand if they would qualify. I don't remember if there has to be an entry, a registration within a club or not. But if there are points and prizes associated with that, then yes, it would have to be registered. But I can't remember if there is a registration clause offhand.

MS. BASCO: That would be very valuable to know because, like I said, there are a lot of those events that are going on. And they're only registering their tournaments and they're not registering their yearlong club events.

MR. NELSON: My initial reaction, and I will double-check and get back to you right now, is that they would have to be, let's see -- "Tournament

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is defined as any fishing competition involving Atlantic HMS in which participants must register or otherwise enter, or in which a prize or award is offered for catching or landing such fish." So it's kind of gets to your point, but still that "or otherwise enter," is still a little ambiguous. So --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Certainly, any comments on how one can better define the tournament, and if there is a reason or a rational basis to distinguish between a tournament and a contest or other type of event, we'd certainly like that input, and could revise the definitions accordingly. Mike Leech?

MR. LEECH: Okay. Once again it appears that the weight of rebuilding the Atlantic billfish is on the shoulders of the recreational angler, even though we probably account for 1 to 1-1/2 percent. In the book we were given here for the year 2001, '02, and '03, the RBS shows that we caught 330 blue and White Marlin. In the other figures we were given earlier, 3,000 some sets of Longlines reported 3,155 White Marlin only, it didn't include blues at all, landed or released. If half of those died, it's still five times more than the recreational landings.

And I know this post-release mortality in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

both. And when you analyze it, all the recreational and all the commercial put together, probably, isn't going to make a measurable difference in rebuilding the billfish. It's -- they're both such relatively small numbers. Why are there no commercial recommendations? Everything in here is recreational. There is not a single commercial proposal.

MR. NELSON: To take those, sort of, one at a time. There are, obviously, in the area closure section, area of closures looking at -- reducing commercial by-catch of billfish. In terms of the

at a time. There are, obviously, in the area closure section, area of closures looking at -- reducing commercial by-catch of billfish. In terms of the mortality of rec. versus commercial, if you look at the ICCAT report, national report from 2000 and for -- the most recent one, you get 19 tons of pelagic Longline dead discards. You've got 19 tons of rotten -- of dead fish attributable to recreational rod and reel, right there it's at 50 percent. Like you said, there it's 50 percent each. With regard to what --

MR. LEECH: Is that a published report some place? I've never seen it; I'd like to see it.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ NELSON: It's the ICCAT national report from --

MR. LEECH: Is it on a website some place?

MR. NELSON: Yeah. You've got with regard

to White Marlin, in this most recent year in 2003, the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

mortality attributable to -- and this is known dead fish, this doesn't factor in post-release mortality or anything. For White Marlin, it is substantially less. It was 3.6 percent instead of 50 percent. Just to give you a run down, not to harp on this point. But for Blue Marlin, the mortality attributable to the -- to rod and reel from '99 through 2003 is roughly, and this is from -- this is comparing PLL dead discards to rod and reel fish that are known dead, 31 percent, 28 or 29 percent, 42 percent, 26 percent, and 50 percent are the mortalities attributable to rod and reel for those -- from '99 to 2003.

And with White Marlin, it is substantially lower. It's 8.4 percent, 3 percent, 17 percent, 15-1/2 percent, 3.6 percent. So it's generally substantially lower. There are, like we said, some new -- there is some new information on post-release mortality on J-hooks, which is of concern, when you look at the ESA potential listing review that is coming up. And let's see -- in terms of -- your other point was that U.S. measures -- U.S. acting by itself isn't going to necessarily solve the problem. I don't think anyone disputes that.

The problem we're in is U.S. law is U.S. law and we're required to do what U.S. law dictates,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

even if we don't -- even if it isn't going to solve the whole problem, we are constrained by what the law says we have to do domestically. So I don't think anyone disputes that even if we eliminated all U.S. mortality, it's going to turn white or Blue Marlin around. But that being said, we don't have any discretion trying to reduce the over-fishing that's occurring on those stocks.

MR. LEECH: I was wondering if anything was done at ICCAT or what was reported at ICCAT, maybe John Graves can answer this, regarding compliance of the other ICCAT nations of releasing the live billfish that are brought into the boat. Is there any compliance with that?

SPEAKER: Well, there certainly has been some compliance with that. At last year's meeting, when we looked at the compliance tables, the overall, the total, if you looked down the entire column of reporting contracting parties and there were some problems with non-reporting. It was clear that reductions had been made. But it was also clear that the mortality reduction targets had not been met which was about 65 percent for White Marlin and about 50 Blue Marlin, if I recall.

So at that point, we asked questions of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

specific countries and there really wasn't much offered, in terms of measures that would be taken by the other party. So we still have some ways to go in encouraging and getting ICCAT to enforce its recommendations on reducing mortality for white and Blue Marlin. But again, the overall story was yes, reductions were evident in the compliance tables, as reported, but not meeting the targets that ICCAT had originally stipulated. And certainly, we look forward to the next stock assessment to see how well whatever reductions have been made are going to be reflected in the stock status. John Graves, counter that point?

MR. GRAVES: Yes. I think you need to into perspective here take that this was recommendation that passed in 2000 and didn't go into a fact until 2001. And then the way ICCAT works is its -- each nation is responsible for implementing domestic legislation that will enable the ICCAT recommendation. And even in the United States, we sometimes lag behind by a few years. So you have that delay and then on the fact that whenever they implement it, we're not going to get the data to ICCAT for another year and a half. So actually, the 2004 fishing year was probably the first time that some of these nations could possibly even have had this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reduction evident, which is why we'd like to look a little further at landings in the next few years.

But one of the major harvesters of blue and White Marlin in the Atlantic, which is Brazil, has gone into a no-sale provision and no retention. So they have implemented that. But that won't -- they just did that last year, so we're not going to see it. So in 2004, this would probably be the first year that you would see the entire year where they're doing that. So we wouldn't see that until some time in 2006, if we're lucky, for the assessment.

SPEAKER: Okay, I guess two countries out of 34 ICCAT members, is pretty good for ICCAT. The -- I would really hate to see mandatory circle hooks for the general fishing public. I think it would make lawbreakers out of thousands and thousands of anglers who don't understand circle hooks, how they work, probably, would not comply. But I've got a suggestion that, possibly, if we have to have some mandatory thing, that it would be in tournaments. The South Florida tournaments already require circle hooks, just in tournaments that people don't like circle hooks and they don't want to fish them, they don't fish in the tournaments.

The people that have fished in the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

tournaments have found, "Gee, circle hooks aren't too bad. In fact, our catch rate is the same or better. And once we hook a fish it, probably, is not going to get off." Statistics have been shown down in Guatemala that it's a phenomenal fishing tool. We require it in the IGFA tournament in Mexico. And they will accept it in tournaments. And that might be a place to start, if we have to go to circle hooks at all, if we have to do something mandatory, that might be one thing to consider, is start with the tournaments.

SPEAKER: Thanks. Yeah, and that is -- that's alternative 3. Thanks.

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Chris. On this issue of circle hooks vis-à-vis J-hooks, in our area, we're basically trawling for Tuna with incidental catches of white and occasionally a Blue Marlin. And you put any time offshore, in contemporary times, you're lucky to catch one or two White Marlin a year. Maybe one boat in a fleet will run into a Blue Marlin on the edge somewhere during the year, not a heck of a lot. The difference with the circle hooks -- and I've used them inshore, I've used them for other species, but they are not a trawling mechanism. And they're

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

basically a -- when you're using bait and you're drifting bait back to fish, whether -- and they -- even including sharks, I guess. And they will get them in the locks and they'd be less, more talented, they don't swallow the bait. They don't swallow the bait as deeply with a circle hook and so forth and so on.

But when it comes to trawling with lures, 90 percent of the billfish hookups are either in the jaw area or, as often as not, probably of those fish that are caught 50 percent are bill, they hit the lure, the trawl lure and they snag themselves in the exterior rather than inside. And I don't see, under that type of fishery, whether they ingest the fish, the bait, rather than the artificial bait in this case or perhaps the red ballyhoo or something else. need to go to the circle hook -- the mandated circle hooks for a trawling fishery, which is what we do for the most part in our area. So -- and if I'm wrong here statistically, someone stop me. I'm neither a statistician nor a biologist, but I've fished enough offshore, which I put a lot of time in because I like to do it, amongst other reasons, as well as, my business being based on it to a great extent, I don't see the difference. .

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I know when you're speaking about your program, Nelson, which is, you know, certainly commendable, we are talking about baited hooks for the most part and the value of circle hooks in that type of fishery. I don't see it for a trawling fishery. But, you know, I'm no expert on anything.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

Jo. Anybody else down there -- Bobbi Walker?

MS. WALKER: I have two comments I'd like to make. The first is on the 250 fish limit. If you're going to use that, then count the fish harvested in the same manner you did when you agreed to the 250 fish. Don't change in the middle of a rebuilding program. I know from serving on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, one of the things that we're mostly criticized about is that we put regulations into effect that are only on paper and they're absolutely unenforceable.

And I would ask you, have you checked with the U.S. Coast Guard and NOAA law enforcement officers to find out their opinion on how you're going to enforce circle hooks? Because I know in the Gulf we have boats that make multiple day trips, and they may billfish on one day and they may bottom fish on another day, and I just don't see how it's going to be

enforceable.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Well, we do understand that to be a problem that's addressed in many fisheries, even with things like mesh size where a trawl vessel might want to use, that's of various sizes, whether or not you can have the nets stowed, and things like that have always been issues. But certainly, this would be even more thornier problem to deal with, with several different hook types allowed onboard. So we've taken that into consideration and again the discussions are ongoing. Russ Nelson?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, let me preface this by saying that I'm here on my own. I'm not here for any client or anybody else. I'm just speaking for myself and in my public service here for this advisory body. Yeah, I think that we should require circle hooks for anybody fishing for HMS species. But I have to agree with Bobbi and from my experiences as a fisheries manager, on a typical day off South Florida, I might go out with my brother, and fish, and we would anchor up, and drift some baits, or put some kites out in 100 feet of water, and I could catch a cobia or occasionally a wahoo, certainly some dolphin or sailfish or king mackerel or Spanish mackerel. You

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

don't know what you're going to catch. And you can't really enforce a rule that says -- unless you're going to say that everybody fishing in saltwater, for whatever they're fishing for, has to have a circle hook; you can't enforce it. But I agree with Mike, it certainly would be enforceable in -- at the tournament level.

And so I think that we should require that in any billfish tournament circle hooks be required for natural baits. And I think we should do whatever we can. I don't know if that means having to promulgate a rule that is unenforceable or if it's just a public relations or some way. But I think we should do everything we can to encourage everybody else fishing for billfish and other HMS species to use circle hooks. But that certainly could be required in tournaments.

I believe that tournaments should be required to have a permit, a permit that is revocable, and that they should be required to have mandatory permitting in a reasonable timeframe, post tournament, and that a consequence of not reporting can involve the revocation of a permit. We do this with other fisheries, other vessels, largely commercial fisheries, but it's a pretty good incentive to get

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

your logbook in or your tournament report in. I don't know about increasing minimum sizes. That's really just a stopgap measure. I mean, it's kind of like trying to use a constant catch rate to recover a fishery in some ways. I mean, you can do it and for a while it tends to reduce catch, but then if stock were ever to actually start increasing in size, you just start running into a more bigger fish, and certainly - I mean, I just don't know the efficacy of it anymore. I mean it doesn't bother too many people, though as somebody pointed out.

The idea of a one fish -- billfish per vessel limit is probably not going to affect more than about one half of 1 percent or one quarter of 1 percent of all the trips out there. So I mean, if you want to do something that nobody will get annoyed at, I suspect you could do that fairly easily. I think that we should prohibit the retention of all White Marlin for a set period of time. Probably, put that in with the Sunset provision to give people some confidence that that is not going to be a permanent measure. But given the difficulties that we're facing and we have faced, the litigation and other things that we faced over the potential endangered species or ESA status of this fish, I think it only make sense,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and that's what I think.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks, Russ. Ellen Peel?

MS. PEEL: Certainly, start off by reiterating that we keep objectives 13 and 14 in place. In terms of circle hooks, it's an interesting item -- a tool to work with. We find in our community that there is quite a large percent of people who do embrace them. They're -- it's not 100 percent yet. I do hear -- and I would ask for your assistance on this, as you draft a rule to define circle hooks. I've talked to some of the guys in the commercial industry, the folks who sell them, that say there are hooks out there by different manufactures that are called circle hooks that really aren't circle hooks.

So I think you need to be specific, if we want to get the conservation benefit here. We want to make sure that we're looking at hooks that really are effective. From tackle manufactures and sales, I do hear the argument and have heard the argument that, "Give us some phase in." Now what's realistic, whether it's you know six months, you know, by the time you get this plan in place, whether that will be timely enough, but I hear the arguments on give us a phase in, and then the enforcement seems to be a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

continuing problem but I will defer to the folks here from enforcement to explain how they might suggest handling that. Whether starting off with mandatory circle hooks in tournaments certainly gives you the greatest leverage on enforcement, and then you're going to get a lot of people who embrace them.

I mean, in tournaments there're a large percent, the biggest percent of the population probably are -- you may find that they're using them other than for artificial baits. They're going to use them outside of tournaments. But the two concerns are phasing in and enforcement defining it. Defining the -- what makes the circle hook?

In terms of prohibiting landings of White Marlin, we have a serious problem, obviously we all know. We have to -- we cannot take that out of the options of prohibiting White Marlin landings.

I know it's going to impact probably a couple of tournaments. You know, whether that too needs to be put in as a phase in and with a sunset, but I think we have to leave it on the table as we go through this process and evaluate what's going to give us the best return.

I have a question. The options here talk about prohibiting landings of marlin in tournaments

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and/or prohibiting them completely, or prohibiting them I think just outside of tournaments. I know, this year at ICCAT my understanding was that we went with the idea that the 250 applied to the tournaments.

Now, you do have the 250 in here to be considered, to be codified but, you don't specify, I don't believe whether -- how you were considering that to be applied; whether it was in or out of tournaments or total? But certainly I assume we're going to have to be consistent with the position at ICCAT. And to the point that Dewey made about, he said, "arbitrary capricious on the 250." There was a rational means of selecting that number at ICCAT. And as Bobby pointed out, if you're going to change the counting method, either be consistent in the counting method or go back and look at -- at where that number was derived from and either stay with the number or adjust it accordingly.

But, I think we have to look at the 250 and be consistent with what we're doing at ICCAT. In terms of tournaments, if permitting tournaments gives you a greater opportunity to get data, I don't know -- you were saying that you're not getting mini phone ins outside of tournaments. But I am hoping that you're getting most all the events. We'll certainly do more

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to try to help, help you get that. But certainly having a permit and making them all mandatory reporting, gives you, I would think, a greater opportunity to collect.

I raise one more issue on data collection that I've raised for at least three years. And I know it's a difficult one to answer because I've talked to general council a couple of times, and I've talked to HMS a couple of times and no one really knows what to do.

And I don't want some of -- some member to get in trouble because we don't have an answer, and I am afraid, though I've talked to Chris or I've talked to John Oliver from Tournament Docks (phonetic) before on my cell phone, I am afraid if they get a citation, no one is going to remember that. But there are a few foreign flag vessels that fish some U.S. tournaments. You see it primarily in the Caribbean where you have boats coming from Curacal (phonetic), coming from Dominican Republic, coming from British Virgin Islands fishing U.S. tournaments. You know, I am sure some of those tournaments are all released or you may have a few that land. If they'd land, then you'd probably decide what you're going to do with their statistics. But my concern is in terms of an angling permit. No

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

one knows the answer. I don't know the answer, but certainly don't want people who're trying to be responsible anglers to get hit by a citation, and I've asked for three years for this to be looked into and no one yet has been able to give us an answer.

So we look forward to getting started on the process and go to the public and get the feedback for you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Ellen. Just two quick responses to your question. First on the 250 fish, for those who were had the pleasure of being in Morocco, the original draft of the U.S. proposals said the U.S. would restrict it's recreational tournament landings to 250 fish. During the course of negotiations, we eventually had to cross out the word "tournament" to get the adoption of that recommendation with the support of several other delegations. So, it clearly refers to 250 recreationally landed fish, which would include tournaments and non-tournaments. That is the interpretation of the ICCAT recommendation.

Now if we did move to prohibit White Marlin because the recommendation also says 250 blue and White Marlin combined, more Blue Marlin could be landed up to the 250 limit because we wouldn't be

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

landing White Marlin. So hopefully that clarifies that issue.

With respect to foreign flagged vessels in U.S. tournaments or even -- what are they called? Cruising permit -- to cruise from one port to the -- to another during a fishing season along the U.S. Atlantic seaboard. They can get HMS permits through our system. I know initially the computerized system could not handle the registration numbers. There was pretty much set up for either the alpha-numerics of a state registration or U.S. Coast Guard documentation. And the system just was unable to accommodate what could be random from the computers perspective, whatever foreign registration systems. But we have a system now, I don't know if --

SPEAKER: Yes, Brad's here.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: -- Brad's here, whether he has to intervene with a little of human touch, so to speak to make it happen, or whether the system can now accommodate it as people enter it.

SPEAKER: I was actually going back and revising the system so it does have country codes available if they want to --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes. So those permits now -- originally the Magnuson Act, with

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

respect to all the foreign fishing provisions, it's had a very lengthily section on governing international fishery agreements and the State Department this and that, and all this commercial fishing with Tailfin (phonetic) and joint ventures. But then there was a little clause at the end that said, "But none of this applies to recreational fishing." And that was interpreted to mean that you didn't need to issue recreational fishing permits to foreign flagged vessels.

But since that time, when Magnuson was reauthorized, and I am not sure whether this was in 1990 or '96, it does have a provision that if state or other federal fishery management plans require recreational permits, they can also be required of foreign vessel.

So again, the Magnuson Act speaks to it. The system can accommodate it. However, if it is a foreign flagged vessel, it should not count as a U.S. landed marlin. It should count against that country's allocation or if it's -- if it's a non-ICCAT contracting party, I guess, we would have some issues with it landing a marlin, in particularly in the U.S., and may be we shouldn't count and accept that activity.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ELLEN: One other question on registering tournaments currently; how do you handle U.S. incorporated tournaments that are outside of the U.S. jurisdiction?

SPEAKER: Well, the regulation stipulates that the tournament has to be from a U.S. East Coast port, I mean that's a part of the definition. there are some that have contacted us, that are operating in the Bahamas had send us their information. We do include those in the database with an asterisk next to them, and it's obvious where -when we put the location of the tournament, that it's not in the U.S. So they are -- they're included in the registration database. And then, like we said, it's the science center handles how they record those fish.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Point of clarification, Russ?

MR. NELSON: Yes, thank you, Chris. I mean, this - something occurs to me. I mean, we -- if there's a U.S. vessel who fishes entirely outside of the country, they still have to be registered, they still have to meet all our requirements in that. If there are going to be actions taken that limit take or whatever, requires circle hooks, or do anything else

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for tournaments under U.S., under the Billfish HMS
Plan, then it would seem to me only reasonable that
those regulations would require to any U.S.
corporation who ran a tournament, whether it runs it
from U.S. soil or whether it runs at in Venezuela or
the Bahamas or anywhere.

So I think that that's just something that
certainly should be looked into. Otherwise we stand if we're going to take some action against
tournaments, we stand to create a -- well an advantage

certainly should be looked into. Otherwise we stand if we're going to take some action against
tournaments, we stand to create a -- well an advantage
to those people who are working offshore that would be
counter to any conservation intent of our regulations
and would also give them perhaps a competitive
advantage over the U.S. tournaments that had to follow
through with these regulations. So I think it should
be -- if it's a U.S. corporation, it's U.S. people
running the tournament and making money for the
tournament, wherever they are holding it, it seems to
me they ought to be subject to these kind of --

SPEAKER: -- saying your part.

 $\label{eq:MR.NELSON: -- sanctions or frameworks or regulations, or -- Thanks.}$

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Phil Goodyear (phonetic)?

MR. GOODYEAR: Yes. I just like to make a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE. N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

quick comment about post release mortality. It's clear from all of the literature and data I've reviewed that circle hooks are much better in terms of minimizing post release mortality than j-hooks. But I want to caution you that we have one estimate, which is from John's study, of what the j-hook post release mortality is. And that applies to a very small segment of the fishery with a very small sample size. So what I'm cautioning is don't base your opinion about how much you're going to gain based on the 35 percent difference between circle hooks and j-hooks from that one study.

It's clear that there will be a gain, but we don't know exactly how much it's going to be. Certainly circle hooks cause more than a zero percent mortality. That's really all I wanted to say.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks, Phil.

Bob Pride?

MR. PRIDE: Thanks, Chris. Going back to this definition of a tournament for just for a minute. In Virginia Beach, Anglers Club, Peninsular Saltwaters (phonetic), Poor Fishers Association (phonetic), Tidal Anglers Club (phonetic), and couple others that I can think of in southeastern Virginia, they all have what they call an annual tournament, but

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it's really a contest. And what happens is, you catch a fish -- whether it's a striped bass or a Tuna or you release a marlin or whatever it might be, and you fill out a little card or a piece of paper and you turned it into the club that month. You're eligible to win a monthly prize, that might be a \$10 check or, you know, a piece of an expensive tackle.

And at the end of the year the top fish in all the different categories usually by species are eligible for some kind of trophy or plaque or something like that. And from what I just gathered, those are all tournaments now that would need to register if they do interact with HMS species. And there are hundreds of them up and down the coast. Hundreds. So I think, you know, probably every little fishing club in New Jersey has one and there's - I don't know how many fishing clubs are in New Jersey these days, but there are bunch.

So I really think we need to get that very much clarified and get that communicated, because I did not understand that those were included. I really didn't I've been -- I've actually been miss-informing clubs. And the fish may be being double counted if some have registered and then the anglers are individually turning in their fish also.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Although we don't have too much evidence of that happening so -- Yes, so, or catch a fish in a tournament and enter it into the club contest. So I mean, and that happens, I mean, very often a fish could be entered in three or more tournaments in one weekend. You know, not so much HMS's in shore species but it's possible.

A second point on the 250 fish, you know, I agree that we shouldn't memorialize this and take any action and try to reduce that, but it brings us back to why we're in this position to begin with, which was poor data. And we've talked about the poor data, and we've talked about catch cards and tail tags and other things that we could do with some of these species to improve our record keeping, and I think we should proceed along those lines and do what we have to do with ICCAT in 2006.

With respect to by-catch issues, both in pelagic Longline fishery and the recreational fishery.

Pelagic Longline fishery has already endured time and area closures, implementation of circle hooks, they've had a involuntary effort reduction, and at this point I think we need to see the results of all that before we worry about doing something new.

The other thing I would say is that the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

circle hooks could be an effective tool to reduce bycatch mortality and the recreational fisheries, and I
think we should at least start with an outreach
program, you know, from NMFS to educate people about
using them to find out what circle hooks are,
recommending which hooks work better, you know, giving
-- maybe workshop kits for fishing clubs to use -that sort of thing. Something that could be
relatively inexpensive but to get the process started.

And as we learn more, you know, from studies like John's, perhaps we can, you know, come up with some mandatory requirements of what would make sense.

That was it believe, it or not. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Bob. Louis Daniel?

MR. DANIEL: Thank you, Chris. I would certainly agree with Bob, in term from the state of North Carolina's perspective on the need to analyze what the impacts of all these closed areas and impacts to the Longline fleet have been before we add more to that sector. I would agree with Mike Leech that the mandatory circle hooks across the board would definitely create a significant problem. I won't speak to using them in a tournament or not. I'll leave that to some of the other members, but certainly

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

main story circle hook would be real problem for some fisheries.

You know, I agree with Russ Nelson. You know, this scrap we're in with ESA listing for White Marlin could really create a significant problem for all of us sitting around this table, as well as all of our industries that potentially could interact with White Marlin.

And back to my comments two or three years ago, you know, it make no sense to me why our rank and file recreational fishermen would need to land a White Marlin. It just makes no sense.

I don't really have a feel one way or the other in terms of the tournament landings, but certainly not -- prohibiting non-tournament landings of Atlantic White Marlin would be a step in the right direction. Because as I understand the 250 fish, it's really sort of a cow-tow to ICCAT -- trying to show to them that we're serious about marlin management and want them to try and at least in some measure to follow a suit to some shape or degree.

The last question I have would be more of a procedural question and that is, is there a rebuilding time frame for the Atlantic white and Blue Marlin, and if so, how long is it? And if not, how can we -- how

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

do we move forward without a rebuilding plan? What I understand, the impacts of the U.S. fishery both commercial and recreational on bill fish is negligible, and that actions that we take are really more ceremonial than substantive in terms of the coastwide, worldwide population.

But I'm fearful of the mandates under the guidelines for implementation of Max and Stevens (phonetic) that we have to have rebuilding plan in place for over-fished stocks.

MR. NELSON: To answer the last -- well two questions -- I think in the pre-draft document I did include a -- whether a percentage of the U.S. take or mortality is versus the international -- I think it's about four and a half percent. I can't remember exactly, but I think it's in there.

In terms of -- is there a rebuilding plan? In effect, there is not. There is a -- the plan at ICCAT 0013 is I believe the recommendation was termed that "the rebuilding plan." It's really more of a mortality reduction plan because if you read further into the document, it then says that, after these measures are implemented, ICCAT - or the SCRS will reevaluate it and the ICCAT will develop a rebuilding plan if necessary. So while it's labeled a rebuilding

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

plan, it's really a mortality reduction plan.

And so there is not a time frame with milestones or anything like that, set in place to actually rebuild the population. There are significant steps taken to reduce the overfishing in the fishery, but there is no formal time frame for rebuilding set in place.

MR. DANIEL: Yes, to that point, what ICCAT had envisioned was a two-phase program. Phase one being, let's get some mortality reduction to at least stem the -- stem the tide so to speak, and then based on what we can accomplish and what information can be gathered, there's still some disputes, I guess you could say, scientific disputes on the nature of the stock assessments and the models used, and hopefully that will all be resolved at that the next occasion to do the stock assessment.

I know they had the intercessional meeting in Japan -- I certainly didn't go to it. I don't know if John, you had the occasion to go there. But they were going to look at modeling techniques and the so-called habitat utilization model. But as Russ said, clearly the indication was that, in phase two there would be an attempt to identify target stock sizes and time tables.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

That has not yet occurred because the stock assessment has been delayed and for good cause to get more information on the effective measures taken and to resolve some of these scientific differences, let's call them, on the modeling approaches.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes. I've got a few comments but anyway, the first one - I've used circle hooks in sail fishing in Mexico the last two years and certainly see the light, and they're very effective. I use them White Marlin fishing and sail fishing up this way. As Blue Marlins go, I think, in my area, the verdicts still out on the Blue Marlin. In my opinion, a Blue Marlin feeds completely different from a White Marlin or a sail fish and the technique on most White Marlin and sail fish is you drop it back and lock it up, so it gives the fish -- eats the bait.

Blue Marlins, usually when I fish, I fish everything locked up, so it's usually a big hole and a bent pole. And normally that fish is hooked in the mouth and that's pretty much way it is, so, you know, I think, from an enforcement standpoint, you're going to have a little bit of a problem, because in our area a lot of people put a Hawaiian eye or an island of (phonetic) lure over the top of a bally-hoo, and you

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have a guy from the enforcement climb on your boat and say, "Well, let me see your lures." And he pulls out this thing, and he says, "Well this is my lure." And it might not have a bally-hoo on it and he says, you know, he says, "Okay, you're okay." And then he climbs off the boat, you put a bally-hoo on it and stick it out there.

So, it would certainly present a problem, I think, trying to make them totally mandatory for tournaments. As far as every day fishing, I agree with everybody else in here; it's going to be really tough. You know, when I leave tomorrow I'm going Tuna fishing, but I may hook a Blue Marlin and catch it.

And trying to establish parameters for what, you know, who is marlin fishing and who isn't, you know, you've got to be in a certain depth water, you know, how far off shore. It is just -- it would be very tough on the people who have to enforce it.

As far as the minimum size limits, I think the Blue Marlin could easily be raised to 105. I mean, most tournaments are a 400 pound minimum, 105 usually equates there, but I'm kind of like Russell, I think that we have kind of stretched that out pretty well. You know, we've peaked it out about as much as we can. And, I guess I'm ignorant. I thought we

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

already implemented a one per day limit. I know North Carolina has, and I think Florida has -- I thought I saw that on their reports.

So I certainly think we could do the one per day, per vessel on white or blue, not both. And I still hear the White Marlin and I certainly have, other than the White Marlin Open, which I know they depend on killing a White Marlin in that tournament, but, I think we could almost live without it.

As far as the landing restrictions, I never did -- this is a question, when does a year start? January or June?

SPEAKER: June 1st.

MR. WHITAKER: Okay.

SPEAKER: Or May 30.

MR. WHITAKER: Okay, it may change? Well, of course, that would certainly affect tournaments that are in May and in our area and would need to be looked at. A couple of more comments.

The charts in the SAFE report indicate, I think, a 143 registered tournaments for Blue Marlin, and a 125 for White Marlin, but I think this number -- I think all the tournaments that are White Marlin tournaments are probably -- these are all the same. So really, we're only looking at about 143 registered

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tournaments versus somebody said 300 or 400. So, we need to clean that up and find out what the real universe is.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ NELSON: Would -- I'm sorry, the three or four hundred is not just billfish, it would be all ${\operatorname{HMS}}\,.$

MR. WHITAKER: Okay, well, I know -- talking about what Bob said, North Carolina has their own citation program, which is considered a tournament, and I guess that would need to be counted. The -- and if -- I mean, if you want data collection again -- if you're going to have the tournaments have to have a reporting card, then, you know, make them turn in results before they get their card for the next year. I think that's only way you're going to get results that we're all going to be happy with. And I wasn't aware that -- I guess I was, but anyway, if we've got to count the fish that U.S. vessels are catching in the Caribbean, especially the Bahamas, they had a killer year on Blue Marlins down there last year, and there was several that would be -- they'd account for several Blue Marlins down there, and probably not just the Bahamas, you know, the whole Caribbean.

I mean, there are bigger faster boats and lot of guys stay out of the country the whole year

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fishing. And that's about it. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Ron. Henry Ansley?

MR. ANSLEY: Yes, I think that date that I mentioned to Chris earlier, I called -- we've been asking -- we talked about this -- oh gosh, before the first amendment was about putting in even more restrictive language. Allowing states more restrictive language to prevail over the federal, and then we were told to wait to bring it up until we started to talk about bill fish issues. So I'd like to bring that up again. It would be similar to the council's language and since we are catch and release, that's -- that would certainly help us out.

And, so I guess with White Marlin, we wouldn't have a problem with going to just catch and release, since we already are. And, I did -- that was a curious thing, I was worried -- would a -- is a records program considered a tournament under the definition? Because we are state record program, and I know you can IGFA. Do we have to register?

MR. NELSON: I mean, again I would have to see exactly how you -- how your records program is set up. But if they're registering in their given points or surprises -- I don't know if a certificate counts

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

as a prize or not? That's pretty questionable. Is a piece of paper a prize? I don't know. If it's a check, that's a piece of paper, that would be a prize, but I don't know.

Greg was saying if it sounds like if they are just a state resident and they are landing a fish, they are sort of "enter by default" if they send you the documentation that they landed the fish. So, does that count as registering or otherwise entering, I don't know. I mean, I would hesitate to say yes, but I can't definitely say no.

MR. ANSLEY: Well, we have non-residents too, that would be entering also -- but, I mean, we wouldn't mind registering, just want to make sure that, you know, just cool with it.

SPEAKER: I'll get to you in a second, Bob.

It is a situation that warrants some clarification, obviously because we have a provision to avoid duplication, that if it's not in a tournament you call your bill fish or Swordfish catch, and if is in the tournament, you can report through the tournament. So if any individual is unsure of his status as a participant or not in a tournament, we may end up with some double counting, and we do need to clarify that.

So again, any advice you can give us on

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

differentiating between a so-called contest and or event, and a tournament would be helpful.

Again, the intent is to capture all landings, whether they are in a tournament or not. But certainly, we want to avoid double counting, and given the emphasis on tournaments in the past, it's because it is the predominant mode of landing marlins. That's why we had adopted that registration and reporting program. To that point, Bob Prime?

MR. PRIME: Yes, very quickly, Virginia has a citation program, just like North Carolina and other states do, and to be eligible to enter in that contest, that annual contest, you actually have to buy a salt water fishing license and submit your fish. So that, you know, that's an entry under the definition that you have. So it's kind of -- you know, I think, we all need to really sit down and hassle this out again. I'm very confused at this point. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Louis Daniel, very quickly.

MR. DANIEL: Yes, just -- If we have a tournament in North Carolina, many times if they bring the fish to the scale, we'll have somebody from the division there write out a citation for a North Carolina certificate as well. So there are many

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

instances where our citation program at least, you would have a lot of double counting. And they may even call this fish in too, so, I mean, you could have triple counting, but it is something we need to do.

SPEAKER: They don't call their fish in though, in North Carolina and Maryland, because you have your tag program. We get your data separately.

And it's factored in and --- so we wouldn't -- shouldn't have to worry about that.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Rich Ruais?

MR. RUAIS: John Graves' revenge. probably mad because I got the last of Bob McAuliffe's rum last night. I just wanted to take this opportunity to respond to -- what I thought was a fairly outrageous comment by Mike Leech that there is nothing in this draft that affects the Longline industry. And I see this draft as continuing the bulk of 2.70 million square miles of closure that have basically put 300 Longline vessels out of business since 1989, probably forcing over 2,000 families into economic ruin. And I think that's quite a contribution by those fishermen. And I just can't fathom the insensitivity towards that issue. Thank you.

SPEAKER: We've already given up a lot too -

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RUAIS: I agree.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, to that point, this section was addressing directed bill fish mortality, mortality attributed to directed fishing and obviously by definition, our regulations do not allow any directed fishing by -- by the commercial fleets so. Although, it's fair to say that there are avenues for addressing -- continuing to address bill fish mortality in the commercial sector, it's not addressed explicitly in this section. So the time area closures and by-catch evaluations sections - we'll deal with that issue. Pete Manuel?

MR. MANUEL: Thank you. Going to circle hooks in tournaments should start off slow like you've been doing -- additional prizes for release points on circle hooks, but you need to define a circle hook. Every manufacturer out there does it little bit different. You need to do the same thing you've done with the Longline fleet. You need to get a -- pick a degree of what's it's going to be and everybody's playing on same level field. And not shove it down their throat, give them some time to react to that. That's going to be an important issue. I know I use an iner (phonetic) hook for drum fishing on the days

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I'm not charter fishing back in the marsh.

And it's -- it's called a circle hook but it doesn't really meet any of the requirements of a circle hook. It has no offset whatsoever. So, I mean that's something that needs to be put in this amendment, if we're going to go to circle hooks that they offset whatever percentage that you arrive at. And I'm sure that fellow from Lindgren-Pittman and Nelson can work with you on that.

The second thing is as far as the commercial/recreational sector, I mean, I've won several million dollars in tournaments. To me, that's a commercial fishing, I mean, I got paid for my catch. We got our picture taken before we took the check, but we got paid for it.

And the commercial fleet has taken a real beating in -- everything has got to be balanced and fair, and we all ought to be looking at the future of every fishery and not just my section. I mean, we need a balance, and you know, that -- if it means eventually going across the board in all fisheries to a hook that's less mortality, you know, it's just going to take some time to experiment with it. But it's something that needs to be addressed in every fishery.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And then the other thing is, if I fish BBC Circuit I go to Bermuda, you're telling me my fish counts against the U.S. quota, if I kill a Blue Marlin over there? Bahamas -- how about Bermuda? If I'm on my boat, that's U.S., but -- even though I get a permit in those countries? But the Longline fleet again, it set the example: when they fish out of country, out of U.S. waters, their catch goes against U.S. allocation. So we ought to be playing on the same field they play on. The other side of the coin would be the non-

U.S. flag boats that are fishing in our tournaments, they should go against their country's count and not against our country's count. And that's about all I got to say.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Pete. We're just past 5:00 now, we're going to take a break before we get into Bluefin. How many more comments on marlin?

SPEAKER: Pretty much the whole side here. So --

SPEAKER: We can do that.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, let's be quick, not that I'll cut you off but again this is a pre-draft stage and we can certainly engage

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you in conversations separate and apart to get more details. So just summarize the main points, please. Bob McAuliffe?

MR. McAULIFFE: Yes, well, most of you here look at me as a commercial fisherman. My earlier days was spent tournament fishing and running tournaments. I was a founding member of the Virgin Island Game Fish Club, which is known pretty much world over. I had to put money up to build that sucker.

What I have to ask Chris, have you looked at all the different scenarios that will partake in the Caribbean? Even in a tournament, you can -- I can go fish on a foreign-flag vessel, a British vessel in an American tournament, go out to the North Drop, hook a fish on the American side, land it, board it on the British side, and we'll have up to six nations that might be in that tournament, and we can go to the south and fish in three different national waters in the same day.

There is going to be a lot of confusion, and who gets credit for what, for this regulations, for the circle hook, or the not-circle hook? If you come across the line you have to have an HMS permit, but if you go back across the line you are on a foreign vessel, do you still have to have it? All of these

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

things. I think in your new position you're going to spend a lot of time looking at the Caribbean, finally.

SPEAKER: As long as I get to look at the Caribbean by being in the Caribbean, that's fine with $\ensuremath{\text{me}}\,.$

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER: Just leave our Rom alone.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, Ken Hinman.

MR. HINMAN: Okay. The emphasis has to be on mortality, I say that over landings. I think in this fishery we're at a point where the landings are an insignificant part of the overall mortality. And I think that's true in the recreational fishery now, not just the fishery overall. And I think that even applies to White Marlin.

You know, people have talked about prohibiting the landings of White Marlin. I don't know that that's really a conservation issue or that there is -- it's so small that there is really any conservation benefit to be gained from that. I think it is probably a legitimate public relations issue for the recreational fishery and it's probably a legitimate strategic issue for the United States at ICCAT. But I don't really see it as a conservation

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

issue.

The only landings restriction -- additional restriction that I would suggest you look at would be in a maximum size for marlins. This is something that we are hearing about again. John Dean would speak to this if he were here, I am sure, but I think there is a strong sentiment among a lot of people that maybe we shouldn't be killing the largest, most-prolific spawners of such overfished species. So that might be something worth looking at rather than raising the minimum size at the other end.

But the emphasis should be on post-release mortality, I think, in the recreational fishery. And I won't repeat everybody -- everything everybody said about circle hooks except to endorse the idea that I think it probably should be a voluntary measure just because -- not just the enforcement problem of a mandatory regulation, but I think it's not just using circle hooks, but it's using them correctly.

And I think it is an education, we are going to have to educate people anyway. So I think the effort should be on trying to get some kind of cooperative system of educating people on using circle hooks, how to use them, getting some kind of consistent and best advice out there. You know, we

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are going to be putting things up on our website this year. And I think there probably can be something that we could all do together so that people are getting -- all getting the same and the best advice on how to go about expanding the use of circle hooks.

And I think the -- now, in the interests of time, I'll end it right there. I think that's about it.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Ken. Gail Johnson?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I am going to go back to a word that I used earlier, and that's 'practicable.'

People have been -- I was dismayed that I didn't hear too much talk about the elephant in the room, and now I guess it's more likely a tyrannosaurus in the room, of the ESA. Realistically, there is nothing any of us can really do to change this. So going back to practicable, looking at the Magnuson requirements and things like that, the issue of 250 fish, that should not be a hard and fast number for these billfish guys.

The U.S. has better data on mortalities for billfish than any other ICCAT member. I have a really strong feeling after looking around in one little piece of the Caribbean that if all of the White Marlin were reported, that were caught, even today that the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

stock assessment would have to look different. And I can't help thinking that the way the White Marlin situation is right now with all of the unreported catches, the foreign catches, that it's nearly analogous to our drug war, that there is a market, somebody is going to fill it.

I really -- I don't have any good answers.

And one other thing about Brazil putting a law in

I really -- I don't have any good answers. And one other thing about Brazil putting a law in place, when I was there earlier, I talked with the company that we do business with out there and we were talking about VMS and other fishery management things. And I said, "How come all the least boats have to do this, but nothing happens on the Brazil boats?" And the answer was, you know, EBAMA -- that is their enforcement agency, and whereas they seem to be pretty good at enforcing any leased vessels, the artisanal and Brazilian boats just pretty much do what they will.

Last year there were still what they call by-catch trips, which include targeted marlins.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you Gail. Nelson?

MR. BEIDEMAN: Yes. Oh boy, Chris is going to be on my ass before I get through all those notes.

SPEAKER: We'll take a break then.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Laughter.)

MR. BEIDEMAN: Now, a couple of things. One thing personally, I've always been in awe of what the recreational, you know, billfish industry has been able to accomplish. It's just no small feat to get people, whether they be fishermen or whatever, but especially fishermen from up and down and all over to be doing 98-99 percent of anything in, you know, our world, our country. And I have always been in awe that your community has been able to do that, and for all that good and right reasons.

Now, we are facing post-release mortality, domestically of course. We all know that pelagic Longline, Atlantic white is the only solution, but domestically we are facing the Endangered Species Act, and we have to talk about such things as post-release mortality. And yes, you know, and numbers can be juggled and the science is soft.

And what Phil brought up is very important, you know, be careful about circle hooks because we just don't know. But it looks good; it looks like, you know, there is some kind of a little miracle here that we have a comprehensive solution to a real bad problem. But a problem really goes beyond all that because we are not really just trying to ensure that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we don't get any outside listing or more restrictions and everything else.

I mean, what your community, and mine, you know, really want and need is for that the first White Marlin that gets added to the stock, that that first one that's below, you know, the replacement yield level, and gets added to the stock, and that's the turnaround point. And we will never get there just fighting against each other, but if we can take, you know, a bad situation that we have domestically, and turned into a win internationally, then we stand a better chance to getting there.

And we are going to get there, but we will get there quicker working together. And that's the way I feel about it, I've always been upfront. Circle hooks I was very encouraged as it got more serious, less, you know, less resistant et cetera as it went around the table. I think that there is some serious support on the circle hooks.

Phase in, I don't know that you could accomplish it too quicker a phase in. I think you're are going to need two or three years at a minimum. And of course part of my job is to press on you, but I think, you know, realistically, you are going to need at least two or three years. Enforcement of that will

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

be a problem because what we had to go to is no J-hooks on board, no J-hooks to catch a Mahi or anything else. You know, that's not going to be an easy problem.

Definition? There is a definition of circle hooks that the HMS division developed and promulgated in rulemaking in the Sea Turtle rule. If that definition becomes revised or altered, we would like, you know, the opportunity to look at other definitions as well. But I think that the -- if you are talking about a true circle-style hook shape and characteristic, the definition is already in the regulations.

Landings, you know, is very difficult. But it seems that your problem with reporting and whatnot is primarily outside the tournaments. And you might want to put as quick of a lockdown outside of tournaments as you possibly can because that's where your problem seems to be. And as far as the data, and that goes to our credibility at ICCAT, you know, it's got to be a tightening up to get the reporting systems that, you know, truly do work.

Then somewhere along the line, we go down yet another one of these arduous roads. We need to think together about such things as comparable by-

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

catch-friendly import measures on all Atlantic HMS. It's probably wisest first to see how it goes a little, but not too far and not too long. If we don't see steady progress where it counts on the 95 percent, you know, we have got to get together and go up the hill.

There is just no two ways about it. We are 5 percent; the rest is 95 percent. We can kill each other in this room today and it's not going to save, you know, White Marlin.

There is another issue that I didn't hear anywhere and I do want to raise. And that's live baiting. Your community needs to think seriously about live baiting, I have some things that I would like to raise about live baiting. And I think we need to have, you know, more science and research in order to make some better decisions as far as live baiting.

You know, the reason for the Gulf of Mexico prohibition of live baiting was selectivity and harm, okay? Because it was possibly attracting more young marlin and it was getting deeply swallowed and that created, you know, a lot of concern, okay. Now, how much that concern has changed now with circle hooks is one question. Another question is if there is the concern about, you know, attracting more and potential

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

harm, you know, should it just be on, you know, one fishery that may even be --

MR. NELSON: -- is dramatic. If used live bait you can out-catch both using, you know, dead bait two-three times. It's dramatic. I'd rather see them boats get loaded up and back in and painting their boats and maintaining their boats and being safer et cetera, et cetera, et cetera if it's unnecessary. If it's necessary then it should be good for the goose and good for the gander.

If it's not necessary with the advent of circle hooks and careful handling and release then we might want to consider some of your first steps as no live bating on J-hooks or something like that to make another incentive to switch over to the circle hooks.

But again, I have always, always been in awe of your industry, your community, because of that accomplishment, to get any group of people to do anything 98-99 percent. You know, that's quite a feat. And you got that behind you and so you can tackle this, and -- you know, if we all work together, you know, the true goal is the fish stock, the healthy fish stock.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Nelson. Glenn Delaney.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ DELANEY: Almost started weeping there for a moment.

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER: Yes, I can hear the violins the background.

MR. DELANEY: Words well spoken and --

SPEAKER: I can't be a good boy.

MR. DELANEY: Sincerely delivered, I know that for a fact. Several points and questions. While I'm talking, could you go to the next slide because I just have a very specific question there? The management measures that were adopted by ICCAT for billfish in Morocco, when was that, 2000-2001? 2000, they're all kind of blurred together, although there was that belly dancer, that thing in front of me at the show, that was really memorable.

SPEAKER: But then there was brain sitting on the table, remember that?

MR. DELANEY: Right. But seriously the measures we adopted at that meeting were not a bad deal. I spent years as, you know, one of the commissioners watching the recreational community try year, after year, after year, after year to get anything at ICCAT adopted with respect to billfish and got nothing done.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And it wasn't until that year that we put 300 metric tons of U.S. Swordfish quota and traded that with Japan to get them to buy in some billfish recommendations. And they said, "Well, what is your recreational community going to do?" It, you know, had been harassing them for years and had built up a negativity in terms of their relationship. And they said, "Well, yeah, if we're going to do something then what they hell are you going to do?"

And, you know, it was a very simple horse-trading type situation. And -- but it broke the ice. It broke a logjam that had existed for many, many years and was frankly going nowhere. And so -- and we sort of, you know, bought and kicked and scraped our way straight into it and got something on paper which is indeed a mortality reduction plan. And, you know, as you said, it's a two-phase program that's intended to eventually be a rebuilding plan with specific timeframes.

But until we know what the mortality reduction results are from that initial set of management measures, we may already be rebuilding for all we know, although that may be a bit optimistic. But those management measures have been extended, including the 250-fish limit, which was one of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

things we had to put on the table and which was done with great consultation with the industry and the affected industry and the Agency -- are extended through to 2006, I believe, and will theoretically expire at that point.

Now, I believe the U.S. is going to want to go to ICCAT and have at least the live-release requirement management measures extended for whatever period of time the next phase is. And so what I hear is the 250-fish limit is something the U.S. may not want to have continued, but from a negotiation standpoint we're going to probably need to put something on the table in lieu of that if that is going to become a very noticeable element to the original plan that is going to suddenly fall out of the plan.

And it may well be that the discussions about circle hooks and the use of them in U.S. tournaments is something that from an ICCAT standpoint is maybe a desirable alternative to replace the 250-fish limit as part of our sort of commitment to ICCAT, that, "Yes, we're taking actually perhaps even a more effective step forward to reduce fishing mortality on marlin by, you know, phasing in circle hook use in our tournaments."

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And the nice thing about that is it sends a message to all those other countries too that circle hooks are good. And we have started talking about circle hooks at ICCAT. I mean, they're starting to get to be the buzz internationally as well. And that would be just one component of a U.S. effort to promote that notion at ICCAT.

So I'm just trying to think ahead as -- you know, believe me, if we had circle hooks or something to offer in the year 2000 instead of 250 fish, I would've been the first to use it. You know, but we just had to have something to offer. And you know, I think the result was very well received by the billfish community at that time. It was a tremendous -- in fact, the three commissioners got an award from the -- including myself, from the billfish community for it.

So, you know, it might seem like a bad deal in hindsight but if you put it into the context of the situation in year 2000, it was a major breakthrough. And so my point is think about what you want to put on the table instead of 250 fish. And, you know, I don't -- and maybe the circle hook approach is something to think about. You know, I'm all for flexibility and phasing in major changes in the fishery regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I work with commercial fisheries all over the country, have for years, and so the opportunity to let, you know, tournaments and the professional fishermen that participate in those sort of set the example for the rank and file and, you know, get out in front of their industry and show them that, you know, at least in tournaments we're going to try to apply this technology and be the guinea pigs to figure out how to make it work, whether it's with artificial bait or live baits or real, what you call, natural baits.

You know, maybe that you figure out those technological solutions so that maybe some day in the future it could be more practicable for the tens of thousands of non-tournament fishermen that are out there fishing HMS everyday. So I would say that, you know, that sort of approach of phasing in circle hooks, I think several people suggested that that might be a good way to go.

I can't imagine -- you know, I'm one of those tens of thousands of fishermen. I like to go fishing with my 13-year-old son for highly migratory species. But not often enough, but I don't know that we would know, you know, how to take a circle hook and effectively use it. Okay. Well, we -- now we know

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

how to find out but I think, you know, realistically there's an awful lot of people out there that would be confounded by it. So that's one point.

On this chart up there, just a very simple question, a clarification. We have as a rebuilding biomass target, BMSY, as -- BMSY. We have as a management biomass target 1.3 BMSY, which is an interesting notion. I mean, at ICCAT our goal is BMSY. So how do we have a domestic management objective that exceeds BMSY, and why -- where did that come from?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: A very — that's a good observation. Well, that goes back to the reticence to give you up that explicit language in the objectives, of maintaining the highest availability. In other words, a higher stock size for a recreationally managed fishery means higher hookup rates, higher interaction rates. And because of the explicit management goal for the billfish plan to maintain highest availability and maximum fishing opportunities, that's why the management goal was higher than what would otherwise be a Magnuson Act requirement for a rebuilding target.

MR. DELANEY: Is that -- are those relative fishing mortalities relative to the rebuilding biomass

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

targets or the management biomass target?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, with respect to the ICCAT rebuilding plan I'm sure that ICCAT under its charge would go for the BMSY. But what we will maintain for the U.S. target is higher than that. And we will continue to strive for that.

MR. DELANEY: Well, you know, for that billfish community you're setting yourself up for a much higher standard in requiring much higher fishing mortality reductions to achieve a standard that's far excessive of the rest of the world. So I don't know if you want to reevaluate that. Do what you want to do but that's a pretty darn high standard to achieve.

That only means your relative fishing mortality is going to be further out of compliance and it would be with the BMSY target which is the standard for most or all fishery managements. I don't know what the real practical implications are in that but you might want to -- yes.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I'm sorry.

SPEAKER: Just talking about that management biomass target, that's how OY in the further billfish fisheries depends. So that's a OY. I just -- shows that target because it's easier to --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. DELANEY: That's a big target you're trying to shoot at. Another last thing, I -- this intrigues me, it's a small thing. But to have a foreign-flag fishing vessel land a fish in the United States, I always thought regardless of whether you're commercial or recreational, was against under the Nicholson Act, I think it's called the Nicholson Act. I mean it's just illegal for a foreign flag vessel to land a fish in the U.S. So I don't know, just be aware of that. I don't think it has anything to do with the Magnuson Act. The Nicholson Act was back in the '50s or '60s or maybe even further than that.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That's correct. I'm certainly not an expert of the Nicholson Act and it certainly has been applied consistently for commercial fishing vessels. Again, the Magnuson Act originally exempted recreational, foreign recreational vessels from just about everything that would be required of commercial vessels but it was updated to acknowledge the state and federal plans were increasingly regulating recreational fisheries and therefore foreign fishing vessels should not be exempt in their entirety. But I haven't researched --

MR. DELANEY: The Magnuson trumps the Nicholson Act in any -- in that respect. It's a -- I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

don't know, this is a angels on the head of a pin --

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I'll ask the} $$ attorneys to ponder that in their spare time.$

MR. DELANEY: Where's our friend --

SPEAKER: Miriam.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ DELANEY: Miriam. She could spend an hour or two on that.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We do really need to wrap this up. We've got Jack and Shana.

MR. DEVNEW: I'd be real brief but just a glance point that goes to the Nicholson Act which is part of the coast-wise trade laws and has to do with that coast-wise trades in the United States. Point of water being actually the same as a port as to why you can't, you know, when you got to be going foreign -- or if you go between two points in the United States you got to be a U.S.-flying vessel.

Very briefly, the issues at hand here are two. One is data collection; one is mortality. With respect to data collection, there's a great comment. Once you get past the issue of what exactly is a tournament, what's not a tournament, you got to have some teeth in it. Someone made a brilliant comment about permitting the tournaments and if they violate the reporting, taking the permit. Brilliant. You

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know, you could throw a fine in there if you wanted to or not but we got to get better data. You guys all -- one of the things you guys have all been very supportive of, always getting better data. So put some teeth into that. That's an easy enforcement.

With respect to mortality, I think the -you know, the circle hooks has great merit. It's a
little thorny when you go past the tournaments but I
think you need to go there. And perhaps with the
tournaments too somebody made a comment about it "If
you get a fish on a circle hook, you really got them,"
or something like that. So you may want to
contemplate de-hooking devices as well, especially
with respect to tournaments.

Regarding landings, I don't know, I really don't have much of a comment on that except that I think that the landings, you know, may have a significantly more economic impact on the recreational industry and you really need to think about that. And, I think, you know, Russell and Ellen and Jim and Rick need to work on that. There seems to be some disparity there. I don't really ever comment on it other than it's a pretty thorny issue. I think it has more economic impact ramifications than does the circle hooks.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Shana?

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Chris. Although I realize it's beyond the scope of this panel, obviously the focus needs to continue on the international realm and, you know, realizing these mortality reductions that are now, you know, loosely required as well as achieving a bona fide rebuilding plan. And, you know, although the U.S. takes such a small percentage of the ocean-wide catch, you know, everything we that can do here leverages what we can ask other countries to do over an ICCAT.

And not to mention leverage to, you know, discourage an ESA listing in 2007 because, you know, the White Marlin are a candidate species and that may be pushed back but it's not going to be ignored entirely. So certainly, for the recreational fishery it seems like the biggest impact is from post-release mortality as far as from, you know, what I've seen with rates estimated upwards of 30 percent mortality.

Certainly circle hooks could be a really good mitigating action that, you know, you're not restricting what fishermen, how often they're fishing, what they're fishing for, you know, you're just doing a gear change.

And I agree with what a lot of people have

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

said about the education of how to use circle hooks and also how to handle marlin. I mean, when I was a kid and we'd go out for fishing for marlin, you know, I'd pull them up on the boat and take a bunch of pictures and "Hey, look at me."

And, you know, now obviously I know that that was a huge mistake. And so there's your rank and file fishermen that still thinks that's okay and as long as they, you know, tow the fish upside down alongside the boat, and whack it against the side of your boat a couple of times, somehow it's going to swim away happily. So I think, you know, the handling is also something that really needs some more education on.

As far as the landings go I guess I don't see the -- I understand that maybe some people would be less likely to charter a boat if they thought that they -- if they knew that they couldn't land a White Marlin, but in this day and age I really -- I mean, you're ostracized if you land a White Marlin or, you know, even a Blue Marlin, but certainly for a White Marlin.

And, you know, there's -- in the pre-draft document it says that by banning landings of White Marlin you may imply that it's, you know, more elite

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

fishery. But it's not a subsistence fishery on the U.S. east coast. You know, people aren't going out to catch marlin for food. It's just doesn't happen.

And, you know, even for taxidermy you get this big trophy price. They don't even use the fish now for taxidermy. So it seems like prohibiting landings wouldn't affect much of the allure of marlin fishing. I mean, that's just my perspective, but you know, I feel that strongly.

And as far as reporting goes I agree with what Jack said. I think Jack was commenting on Russ Nelson's comment that, you know, with data reporting being such an issue, requiring tournaments to report via, you know, the leverage of a permit, that they get it or don't get it, depending on their data reporting, it seems like a no-brainer. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Shana. Last comment?

SPEAKER: I just want to make -- share with everyone, but several of them know about it, but there will be a billfish PBS aired on your PBS station Earth Day week, the 18th through the 23rd, it will be aired, you know, I mean, that's the first showing, April. I'm sorry, April. So if you're interested to check your listing -- but you'll see a number of people from

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this room that have participated cooperatively in this.

Well, we didn't make it, but, I mean, yes, hopefully, I mean, it's a documentary to introduce billfish to the wider audience.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you for that. We're a bit behind. I do understand however that Rebecca Lent has a cameo appearance in that video so all the new folks are required viewing. We're a little bit behind on our schedule. We had anticipated an hour and a half for some recreational Bluefin discussions and we've already used a half-hour of that. I think we can at least get through the presentation and perhaps a little bit of comments if we still want to go through 6:45.

That's about the limit I can handle because of the last train leaving Union station. But you'd be free certainly to continue the discussion on well past that into the midnight hours unless there's no rum left from the last night.

So why don't we take a short break, five minutes? It's probably not much to read or drink back there anyway. Use the bathroom and come back here and we'll at least have the presentation on Bluefin and see how much commentary we can get.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken)

SPEAKER: -- before we calculated the 8 percent. Do we have the option of calculating the 8 percent with the 25 tons?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I believe we do based on the wording of the ICCAT recommendation, but Brad fill me in. I don't know if I used the word "ease" too liberally because it would be, what, two tons difference?

SPEAKER: No, no, it's four years. Four years --

SPEAKER: Yes, on an annual basis when you run the calculations of the 8 percent with and without the 25 metric tons being deducted. Without the 25 metric tons being deducted, it's 119.2 metric tons annually. So it would be 8 metric tons over the four-year period.

SPEAKER: A big relief potential there. Chris, my other question is the 2004 estimate of, I think, it was 359 tons, that is the -- precisely the same methodology that was used for 2002, 2003, no changes whatsoever based on, for example, the species working group recommendation of not making that assumption on the straight line measurement.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

correct, although that is being addressed separately.

SPEAKER: And separately --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Each working group have recommendations.

SPEAKER: Okay. And are we going to talk about that at some point here? I thought this was the time but I -- if you have a better time to be talking about that -- I mean, we wanted to brief the advisory panel on the issue as well.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes. Why don't we go through the comments on management options relative to the 8 percent allocation and monitoring the quota first? Louis Daniel, and then Bob will just continue in this direction.

MR. DANIEL: Thank you. Thank you, Chris. I mean, you know, this is an important issue to North Carolina and particularly since we're held up as the standard in terms of the monitoring program that we have in place with the tail-tag program in North Carolina, and Maryland as well. Certainly, I mean, this is the most valuable fish in the ocean. I don't want to be goofy about it, but I mean it's an extraordinarily valuable fish in terms of price per pound, Ellen.

And certainly -- and I think you ought to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE. N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tag every billfish that comes onboard too. But certainly a tail-tag program for all the states to give us a mechanism to accurately account for this fish is critically important. To make certain that there's fair and equal access to the resource throughout the New England mid Atlantic and south Atlantic.

You know, we got sort of in a pinch this year when someone environmental organizations were concerned about the North Carolina fishery harvesting juvenile fish but not recognizing that a recreational fishery even existed somehow, to the cosigners to the letter.

And so, I mean, certainly one way to address this 8-percent problem would be to harvest only adult Bluefin Tuna. So put in an 84-inch minimum size limit, one fish per vessel per day. And that would resolve your 8 percent problem. And we would certainly support that in North Carolina. If that's the only place it happens, or the south Atlantic is the only place that happens, so be it.

But don't -- you know, let's respond when the responding is reasonable to the criticisms of the South Atlantic fishery with good data, which your (inaudible) study that had, you know, that showed that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

recreational fishery is catching the juvenile fish.

That's where the juvenile fish problem is, all right?

And if we want to really be serious about juvenile fish, let's just harvest the adults.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Louis. Bob Pride?

MR. PRIDE: Thank you, Chris. I mainly want to focus on the 8 percent balancing issue over the four-year period. It seems like, based on the results for the last two years, that we could potentially use up the remaining quota very easily in 2005. And, you know, I'm a little reluctant to go in to a management scheme that would allow us to leave the 117 tones per year in place. But I don't quite understand the implications in terms of catch of one fish per boat, Rick.

Can you address that and do you have any idea what that might result in based on any modeling that you may have done?

MR. SAVAGE: I haven't actually conducted any modeling, Bob, but in one of the previous slides, that -- you know, in theory that if you constrain the catch you should be able to constrain those fish that are landed. But when you look at the numbers and the retention limits for '03 and '04 and how the landings

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

correlate into those school-size category fish, that there wasn't a direct correlation.

And so, you know, the theory would be the -you would be constraining the catch to one fish per
vessel, thus lowering effort. But you don't have a
conclusion as far as what that will end up in
landings. And so, there's still some risk associated
with even that.

MR. PRIDE: Well, you know, based on that, I mean, our -- with the exception of the trunking fishery that's off Chincoteague, you know, our fishery off Virginia Beach is pretty much the school fish. We occasionally get a larger fish but most of them are the smaller fish.

And the grounds that we fish on is -- it's usually in late June, in July. It's a 20-25 miles of Virginia Beach. It's usually not mixed fishery, it's usually exclusively Bluefin and one fish per boat makes that tough. But on the other hand, I don't want to put us in a position of, you know, risk in going over our 8 percent allocation and having more worries at ICCAT. So I guess what I would have to support is the one fish per boat assuming that we don't get any adjustment in the data due to these other ongoing -- Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Joe McBride?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, thank you, Chris. I don't know if it's appropriate but I'm going to throw it in here, tell me I'm wrong. I'm looking at the landing number of fish and estimated weights for New York. 2002, approximately 700 fish, 2003, almost 3000 fish, 2004, 736 fish give or take. Where is this spike coming?

This was the year 2003, after we were under in 2001-2002. Then you did the math again and came up with overages and put as over instead of being under and carrying over -- carrying the underages over to the following year.

I mean, who -- unless -- I'm not a statistician, so I mean, I'm -- but I'm furious with - - these are the figure we're basing on our fishing which is so important to our area. And that's -- I'm going go into other aspects of what our -- if nothing else, gentlemen agreements were with the Agency over the years regarding the zoning the north-south zone and request for a set-aside for our geographical area.

Look at these fish landings I mean, it's skewed so deliberately toward one area and that's south of the Jersey border, south Jersey and Maryland and Delaware, to deny the other area, geographic areas

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

relatively any other fish they're entitled to.

And that wasn't the idea of the plan; the plan was to be fair. And being fair means you have to make your allocations in a manner that gives everybody a shot at the fish. As someone mentioned earlier, I think it was Rick, stating that if we plan in late September and we've asked year after year either a set-aside for the Block Island Sound area, you know, south of Block Island Sound, so we can plan on having fish -- and we asked the figures from three to five or six, whatever you could afford.

But I just don't understand this statistically. How you can go to a spike like that in one year and drop back to the normal spike, around 700, the second year. Now, going back to the some of the requests about the North Carolina procedure of tagging fish. The main port for any Tuna, including Bluefin Tuna in the metropolitan New York area is, Montauk, New York. Now, it's not the absolute only port but it is the main port.

If you look at your figures from Shinacock (phonetic) back west, you're really dealing almost with a Jersey fishery, the north Jersey fishery. They fish the same grounds, wherever they may be. But in the Montauk area we told you we would adhere to a tag

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

program similar to Carolina's. We've said it for years and we would assist you to get a handle on what's going on. You've have never taken it.

We told you we'd pay for it. We told you we would have wait stations in the marinas. We told you we'd let them be mandated coming to the -- whatever we could do to get an accurate count. And every year we get pushed aside and every year you're hurting our industry. We have 1000 boats in the harbor of Montauk, over 100 licensed charter and party boats in the harbor of Montauk that you affect every year with that reduction down to one. I can go into the absurdities of years past where you gave us one fish during hurricanes only a week. And all the -- and we went over that and we started to deal with each other like gentlemen.

And you went up -- okay, you know, I'm not going to say we have to have one fish a man much as I'd like to have that. The edge was three last year when the charter boats could fish. Look at the dates somewhere here when it stopped, exactly when we began fishing in our geographic area, September 20th somewhere, September 21st, I just -- whatever the date was, I just ran across it. I mean, as though it's a slap in a face.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Now, what justification could you have for these landings in the southern zone to be so much more excessive than those in the northern zone? You know, in fairness. And we're talking about fish management here with a very limited resource and, you know, everybody wanted to get their hands on the money and to the fish in the general category. And us looking to make a living and that's not only people in the north, there are people in the south that deal with the angling category wanting to get a fair share but they shouldn't get an abnormal share nor should we get an abnormal share.

It should be divided in a manner that's doable and fair to all the user groups or user areas in this case. And I just think it's wrong and it's a disgrace that a federal agency would allow this type of thing to happen, because if you look here in the states of -- and by the way why, isn't North Carolina on this? Were they exempt from --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: The data here is just the Large Pelagic Survey data. And the Large Pelagic Survey isn't actually conducted in the State of North Carolina.

MR. McBRIDE: Oh, okay, all right. Did they really --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Laughter.)

MR. McBRIDE: I mean, I -- the only way I want to know that is what way could we get ourselves exempt from it too, if we could possibly take our landings. And we'll send you our reports. And the other thing in fairness again, you know, this is -- I mean, let's do away with the recreational category. We'll have the -- all the fish above 83. I think it's a very noble thing to do on behalf of the fish provided you're going to tell me you're not going to sell the fish above 83 pounds or 73 inches rather, whatever the case maybe.

I don't know, I mean, I -- obviously I'm aggravated at this because we come down here year after year, we walk out saying we're going to have a fishery. I tell the people in our organizations, we're going to have a fishery, and we end up having games played with us. And the statistics prove it right here.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, it's certainly a tough problem with respect to allocation because the fish do move consistently in -- within season and between years. And even though we may allocate to a certain region, if the fish are not present during that particular season, they don't get

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

caught.

MR. McBRIDE: Which, the fish -- at which -Jesus, I'm getting -- getting bent out of shape,
excuse me. The fish were there. It was that with one
fish a boat in our area, you can't get the people to
go out. You'd have to change your Tuna trip to an
inshore bass best trip if you're lucky enough to get
people decent enough to, you know, change the mode of
fishing for the day and keep the businesses going.
And it's not necessary -- the fish were there after
September 20th.

And they're smaller fish. They -- you know, we're not catching big a fish and that can be a scenario why there are fish bigger in North Carolina than we're getting up in our area where one time we caught big fish, we don't deal with that. But give us our fishery and give us a reasonable chance that we can maintain our businesses just like these other areas want to maintain their businesses whether it's commercial or charter and party boat or recreational though marinas at all.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thanks

Joe. Bill Adley (phonetic) and Bob Fitzpatrick.

MR. ADLEY: I'm just interested in that these LPS numbers reflect everything that we have been

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

saying about the lack of fish north of Massachusetts.

And also it reflects the fact that we have really no recreational fishery up there left anymore. It's not worth going out in a small boat to try and catch a school of fish because they aren't there.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks. Rick Weber and then Bob Fitzpatrick.

MR. WEBER: Only a very quick data collection issue. You had us fairly well agreeing to a late concept of some form of log yesterday. And we keep discussing data collection issues. We should probably go back and explore that even further, help design something, help consult on something because it's going to help you all the way across the board with all the HMS.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We did have some copies of the fish ticket that Jim had shared with us yesterday. I don't know where they're at. But we'll make sure that they get -- should be there tomorrow morning for folks who might want to explore the fish ticket concept. Bob Fitzpatrick?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Could you put back -- Brad, could you put 2005 options back up on the -- there we go. I think the prohibit landing of school Bluefin in 2005 is a real tough nut for the Virginia

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

people, the charter boats and everybody else to handle. And I think it's unnecessary. Overall, my guess is that keeping it at on a day, depending on where we end up on some other issues, may be the tough bullet that you have to bite going into this here, considering that what's happened the last three years.

But there's another one that's not on here and I know we're not going to discuss it now. So we won't get into it but you can fix it. We've got a length/weight key that's clearly off by 27 some odd percent and we have the 17 percent issue over measuring technique and the contract et cetera, et cetera.

We can solve the whole problem just by making some reasonable decisions with those two issues. And hopefully, I guess we're going to do it tomorrow. We'll enlighten the rest of the panel as to exactly what that's all about. But you really don't have a problem, that's the truth. And we just need to add bullet number, whatever it is, 5 and adopt it and it will be fixed. Thanks.

One other thing, the Massachusetts numbers, 920 juveniles? I don't believe it. I was present at one of the clusters of -- I would like to see the cluster breakdown. We certainly had juveniles present

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

in the fishery; however, on Cape Cod, I questioned that number. Now, perhaps -- what's that -- perhaps Gloucester had massive juvenile landings that I'm not aware of. 24 in Maine? Maybe. Probably more got bootlegged into restaurants but 900 in Massachusetts, not landed on Cape Cod.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Dick Stone?

MR. STONE: Okay. Most of you all are not old enough to remember what really happened or why we got ourselves into this situation but I'm going to reflect back on it just a little bit. And by doing so I have to also reflect back on the call for balance among the fisheries. I think balances ought to be in the international arena as well. And look at the percent, the 8 percent, who else is taking 8 percent? Nobody. 15 percent is sort of the standard, why are we at 8 percent?

Well, we're at 8 percent because we had a year when the Canadians got upset at us and the Japanese happened to along with us and forced us into a situation where we didn't have all the data we needed to have with us because if we had, that 8 percent would have been more than 8 percent, that's for sure.

But there are several things that -- and I

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

think we ought to address -- at some point time, we need to address that 8 percent. I mean, it's ridiculous for us to be doing 8 percent and none of the other countries to be doing anything near that. And there isn't a juvenile problem from a stock standpoint in the western Atlantic. There absolutely is not a juvenile fish problem. So it's all just smoke and mirrors trying to -- you know, in a political arena is basically what it boils down to.

But there also are some things that could help us even in the eight percent and Bob just mentioned one of them. And also the database, I mean again I have to get back on this soapbox. I mean, Brad and I have been looking at Yellowfin and albacore more in recent years, but in the past I have looked at Bluefin databases very carefully. And I know, you know, just as you pointed out, years ago we had a big spike in Massachusetts landings as well. And it's —it was an anomaly is what it was. And it probably was an anomaly with the 900 fish as well. And as I said I've been looking more at Yellowfin and albacore here recently.

I do think that we ought to go with the census, you know, the tag program like we have in North Carolina and Maryland. And I think -- the other

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

day they were looking at or just -- again it's smoke and mirrors. I mean, I think it's about time that we, you know, we stepped back to take a good hard look at what we really should do and not penalize our fishermen because -- with something that really isn't a stock problem. So anyway, I guess I'll stop at that.

MR. DONOFRIO: Chris, thanks. I agree with Dick that the 8 percent's got to change to 15 and we, you know, we're asking our friends also on the other side here, the commercial sector, to work with us on that as we deal with them on their issues at ICCAT. This is important, that we get that changed. But let me try to put this whole thing into perspective on a domestic level here, on how it relates to, how we look at the rest of the world and how we treat the rest of world but how we treat us.

Here we have the director of NOAA Fisheries, Bill Hogarth, actually coming out now in Miami at the boat show. He's done it before behind the scenes in different places but publicly announcing the strategic plan for recreational fisheries and admitting in public that the data collection system in the Unites States recreational fisheries is broken. Okay, so, we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know that now, it's a given, he went public with that in front of all the press.

So what are we reporting on to ICCAT? We're reporting a broken data collection system. And what are we asking for? We're asking for a minimal fishery on Bluefin, which is so important to fishing communities on the coast. A minimal fishery where I think the fishery service has the flexibility to say, "Okay, we're going to give you a season, we're going to give you a size limit, we're going to give a bag limit, we're going to let you go fishing because we know what this fishery means to you," okay? "We're going to fix this system but we're not going to punish you because then we have to look at what happened in Mercia (phonetic), our perspective on the other guys.

Bill's sitting there and we've got John Spencer begging him to go up to 32,000 metric tons from the recommended 28,000 metric tons that the SCRS is telling him. And Bill is, you know, he did debate back and forth with Rich and other people in the delegation; he's torn. But Bill in good faith figures, "Okay, let me get this guy to 32,000." Okay? Gives him the flexibility, the Agency gives the flexibility to John Spencer, okay?

And, you know, we're hopeful that they're

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

going to comply because he made some promises on small fish and he was going to reduce all his other catches. They have done nothing. They have done nothing; they don't even comply. Now they're up to about 60,000 metric tons. We're only asking for a fishery here.

And I think the Agency can create a fishery for us, fix the system, we'll correct the numbers down the line, but do not, please do not punish this fishery here, which is so historical. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks Jim. Jack -- Shana?

MS. MILLER: Just really quickly as far the 8 percent goes. Because the U.S. quota is of course based on weight, the more smaller fish that are taken, obviously the more fish are taken because it takes, you know, and I could do the math, but however many 80-pound fish to equal however many 160-pound fish, say. So I think with this allocation, it really needs to be looked at to make sure that it's done in a conservation-neutral manner.

And as far as the bag limit goes, these Bluefin that are being landed are, you know, they're not of insignificant size and they feed a lot of people. So I don't understand the push for the bigger bag limits. You know, certainly beyond two fish --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and I know in my area there's a big issue with recreational fishery -- fishermen, you know, knocking on the back doors of restaurants and selling their fish. I mean, I know plenty of my own friends that -- I don't why I'm still friends with them but they do that.

So you know, I think that needs to be considered when changing bag limits.

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR} \mbox{ \begin{tabular}{ll} MODERATOR & CHRISTOPHER & ROGERS: & Jack & Devnew \\ \mbox{and then $Glenn.} \mbox{ \end{tabular}}$

MR. DEVNEW: Yes, just very briefly. The Bluefin Tuna industry has been making sacrifices endlessly for an enormously long period of time. And, you know, and conserving here for overages, excesses on the other side of the Atlantic are readily demonstrable and, you know, compliance problems, everything else over there. The industry here has made these sacrifices and has done a very admirable job in staying with in its quotas et cetera.

The IAC, you know, the Bluefin Working Group and everything, did make some points and without belaboring it or going into any detail, if we are contemplating, I guess acknowledging some type of an overage here and we have significant problems in measuring fish and length and weight ratios, then we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

need to address that first to see if we really actually have a problem or not. I guess, I'll leave it at that.

But, you know, for us to go ahead and acknowledge a problem that really isn't a problem, I think would be a gross disservice to the sacrifices made by this industry.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Jack. Glenn Delaney.

MR. DELANEY: Yes, a couple of points. Certainly, dealing with and negotiating with you on the Atlantic Bluefin Tuna is -- certainly has a special place in my heart and a sore place in my brain. And it's been a frustrating process, and you know, I don't want to belabor or pile on here, but only the Unites States could find itself in this situation. And I'm not saying one right -- two wrongs make a right.

But my God, you know, we should not be in a position to be penalizing our fishery for virtual fish that have been a function of some internal measurement or statistical analysis, problems that -- you know, it's confounding to imagine this happening in other nations that participated in ICCAT bringing this forth and then having a negative consequence for their

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

fishery. To the point, you know, I just -- I want to agree with Robert, I keep pretty close tabs in Massachusetts on fisheries, I'm up there all the time, particularly in the north shore and Gloucester. You know, I've heard that, you know, there is a lot of juvenile fish off of Cape Ann and up in Ipswich Bay, they are all summer and all, but to suggest that 900 or some of those fish got landed, I don't know where that happened, it's another one of those mystery situations in Massachusetts, you didn't see it in the Cape, it didn't happen up there, but anyway I don't want to belabor it. Stay away from that one. Actually I just lost track on my thought, so what do you think that it's --

(Laughter)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I think Rich and Rom both wanted to talk, but John is here and would like to say some things for this group, could they -- came out of the IAC, and I'm wondering if it's okay with you folks. If we don't get to it tonight, we will start with you all this tomorrow morning, but as long as John is here, he can't be here tomorrow, it might be good if we hear from him.

MR. GRAVES: All right. Well, there is a couple of issues. What I first like to do is just to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

read from the Bluefin Tuna species working group report, and then I'll go back to the dynamics of the meeting and let Jack maybe take it from there. But this is from one of the recommendations of the species working group. The working group also strongly recommends NMFS convene an independent peer review utilizing scientists not connected to the LPS to investigate recently discovered potential sources of overestimation of angling catches in recent years.

These sources of overestimation include the assumption that survey intercept employees collect accurate straight line measurements requiring conversion to curved fourth link and adding 17 percent to the estimate of the total weight of the angling catch category. The investigation should include consideration of a census or adequate sample of the 900 plus anglers intercepted in the 2002 and 2003 To determine the type of measure conducted, fishery. whether a measure was conducted at all, and to collect any supportive evidence. This information can be used to develop an accurate ratio of straight or curved measures actually conducted in those -- in these two years and to allow any appropriate total catch estimation revisions.

The working group recommends review of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NMFS length-weight conversion key used to estimate the total weight of angler catches. This review should include alternative length-weight data available from the State of North Carolina, other states and other sources included in the historical, general category landings database. Appropriate revisions of the NMFS length-weight key can then be applied to the 2002-2004 surveys, and until the survey is replaced by the recommended census based -- and until the survey is replaced by the replaced by the recommended census based tag-reporting system.

Finally the working group recommends that this independent peer review be submitted to the SCRS for consideration and adoption prior to any revisions to the U.S. historical catch estimates for angling catches. The history behind this is that we did have Dave Van Voorhees present the methodology to the advisory committee at our spring meeting last year, and we were told that the report would be following in a few weeks. We were told that our first fall meeting in the second report that it would be soon forthcoming and in our second fall meeting, the report still wasn't there.

During the discussions with Dave Van Voorhees, it was -- it became evident that some of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

measurements from the contractor who was actually making the measurements were not -- they were not taking straight length measurements, which on a large Tuna is impossible to do by a single individual. separately what you would do for such a straight length measurement on a large fish is to have twometer stick calipers that you would use and you would use two individuals. And I know from my personal experience, which is very limited, but at tournament over a period of several years that the -they have taken curve-length measurements and they've used my tape to do it. So I've watched them make measurements, and so what you have is a situation where they're making a curve-length measurement, which is a longer measurement.

And then they're actually assuming it's the straight length measurement and then applying a correction factor, which increases the apparent catch as it go from straight length to curve length. So they're getting dinged and so this correction has inflated the estimate of the angling catch. And, well, mine was one anecdote, there were anecdotes from several other individuals indicating that, that maybe this was not a rare event, but maybe even a common practice. And so we had asked Van Voorhees and his ad

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hoc committee to review that and respond but essentially our pleas were ignored and the report was just put out without even any mention of this.

So two weeks ago, at the advisory committee meeting rather than going through a complete NMFS bashing of how they don't listen to an advisory committee, the people that are spending their time just like all of us are here, I asked the agency to consider what had been said and to present a plan or to come up with a plan, which would address the concerns of the committee. Now, I know -- and I'll let Jack respond to what's happening, but I will be presenting this report to Bill Hogarth in person next Wednesday. So again -- but what we would like to see is something in the -- to see in the short term that is actually going to be addressed. So I'll let Jack respond to that.

MR. DEVNEW: Thank you, John. We became aware of this as an issue; it was first really brought to our attention last winter, and we've been looking at it since then. And what we determined is that it affects a whole lot of things. So it's not just a simple thing to do. But the issue came back to us as a result of the work of the ICCAT Advisory Committee although John hasn't had a chance to sit down and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

formally present the results of the IAC to Bill. I can tell you that we have that and it's being looked at. I'm going to warn you right now I'm going to cop out a little bit.

But we are moving right now, in fact I was reading e-mails this morning about it. We're moving right now to do what the ICCAT Advisory Committee asked us to do. We're putting together a plan to look at this and see what we ought to do, you know, what's really important here is that we come up with the right number. And so that's what we're going to go ahead and move to do, I can't -- I mean, I don't understand, I'm a lawyer for god's sake.

But I don't understand all of the details of what it is the scientists are doing, but Steve Morowski (phonetic) is personally involved in making this happen, and the plan is being developed, and I'm really -- can't say much more than just that, that we've heard the IAC, we've heard the industry, we've heard the community, we are working on it, we are responding, we're going to develop the plan in response to the recommendation.

And when we do, we're going to come back and let you know what it is, I mean, we're not going to, you know, take another year and then, you know, all of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

a sudden you'll hear from us. Well, it was never really a problem anyway, you guys do know what you're talking about, obviously you know what we're talking about. We have to figure out what it all means. so what I can tell you is we're moving right now actively to do that. John? MR. GRAVES: And I can assume when you get your plan together, not actually execute it, but when you get the plan together you will inform both the advisory committee and the advisory panel. MR. DEVNEW: That's my assumption, but again then Bob?

it's not in my ballpark. So it's hard for me to make that commitment, but that's my assumption. Jimmy and

SPEAKER: Jack, thank you for that. assume that your goal is to get this together before the start of say the June 15th, June 20th season which normally is our kick off for, you know, the East Coast fishery?

MR. DEVNEW: I don't know the answer to that Jim. I don't know.

SPEAKER: Well, yeah, I'm Robert.

SPEAKER: I appreciate the change from the letter that was sent out to what I just heard. However, and I think that the 17 percent issue, you

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

know, certainly can be bandied about and it's probably not 0 and it's not 17 in all likelihood. And I personally participated in measuring with port samplers on at least three occasions, and with me they used my tape and it was a curved measure. However, the -- and that one is more complicated, however, the length-weight key itself isn't a close call. The base runner is at second, it's a force-out at third and the ball is in the third basement's hand and his foot is on the bag. It's not even close.

And in the letter that was sent out there was a suggestion that new monthly data and some finetuning could correct this. We're talking about 25 percent. And it appears to get more dramatic as the fish get smaller. So when we're facing -- telling charter boats and -- that want to go fishing soon that they can't go. Can't we get some -- I mean, we've got several hundred data points, I think at this point that point out that the length-weight key is a mile With those sort of numbers, that eight percent off. issue disappears, I think, multifold. And it seems like it would be good to get some sort of decision made prior to peoples' businesses being impacted as most of ours have been in the last few years of this nightmare.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. DEVNEW: We hear you. And that I'm not going to say anything more than that. I will say that the question of the key is a part of what's being worked on in addition to the question of the measurements; that's a part of it too.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We had -from the last time around we had Rich and Rom sort of
waiting. And we are going to -- we can come back to
this in the morning. But we're going to have to run
out of time here in a minute.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Jack. I wanted to thank John for an excellent job at providing the species working group recommendation and I hope, and I know NMFS has gotten the message that this needs to be addressed. Thank you, Jack. I'm happy that you're able to report to us that we're going to be moving in the right direction. I guess the only concern is the timing issue, of course, I mean, and Robert and everybody in the angling category would love to see an overnight remedy and fix because we deal so strongly that the errors are real.

But in this real world we also know it's not going to happen because once the errors are corrected or -- and we reach agreement on exactly the extent to that, those numbers are going to have to go to SCRS,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we know that, before any revisions to the 2003-2004 database can be made.

Chris, I remembering discussing the process of the pre-draft that at one point you were talking about a second highly HMSAP meeting, sometime in the summer, I believe, to review the comments and I'm wondering if that couldn't be the target of when we get a presentation on where we're going from there unless it can be done by mail sooner than that. That would be my hope and I hope we can move forward.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Rom and then Glenn?

MR. WHITAKER: Okay. I sympathize with Jo, I think we have the fish and we have the quota. We just due to whatever reason we're not getting the count right so he is being penalized for it. We fought the same battle in the Carolinas in the '90s and that's why we had to go to what we have today. To give a little insight on what Robert brought up and what John Graves brought up, I personally, well, I've got letters from 30 chartered captains, professional captains and had or said to have notarized letters stating that in over hundreds of Bluefin Tunas we have yet to see one measured straight line. It just didn't happen. It's all curve length and I'll be glad to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

give those to whoever can use them. But the very main thing I want to say is I hope we're not sitting here discussing this problem next year. I hope we fix it.

MR. NELSON: Just two quick points, I want to just recognize obviously the severity of the problem and the concern and it's been well elaborated, but I also would say that when I hear Jack Donegan make a commitment like that and have people like John Graves involved and Steve Morowski who we worked with for years up in New England, he is tremendous. I mean if he is going to be involved with this, I think it's a great sense of assurance that things are going to be looked at properly and you're going to get the right result at the end of the day. So we appreciate that very much.

Also, when I got distracted on the Massachusetts politics, the issue I meant to bring up before was, of course Ron did -- was the eight percent issue, never travel without it. You know, we -- Jimmy and others, we have, I think, made clear year after year that our industry is certainly supportive of trying to come up with a solution. We've recommended at the ICCAT Advisory Committee for years that this be addressed and maybe I misunderstood but I thought you, kind of took that off the table at the ICCAT Advisory

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Committee, and wasn't something you wanted to pursue with that and maybe we just misunderstood each other, but just -- to 15 percent --SPEAKER: 15 percent. SPEAKER: Well, you know --SPEAKER: Right. MR. NELSON: If we can find a way to make 9 10 11 12 13 sure that was clear. 14 15

that work, you know, that's not something we're opposed to and we can support, you know, 15 percent of the U.S. quota is a -- you know, if we can find a way to make that work internally within the U.S. ICCAT community, certainly have our assets to help push that through if that can be done. So I just wanted to make

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yeah, I see three hands. Pete, Jo and Jim, and then we'll call it a night. Let everybody get some dinner and rest up for tomorrow.

SPEAKER: Brief.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Brief comments. All right.

MR. MANUAL: Basically what I'd like to say is it, you know, this all came about on the chart (inaudible) put a lot of hours and time in it. Probably a whole lot more hours and time in it than

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I've got faith in these LPS numbers, and is a chartered boat captain in Moorhead City who was regulated out of the recreational fishery in the '90s on a regular basis, and then we would say, oops, we found out we didn't count right. So the season — fish are going from our neighborhoods so we need catching up. I feel for Bob, I feel for his business up there.

And after hearing what I heard tonight, maybe we all ought sleep with one fish a day and maybe look at Brad's numbers of a 117 metric tons that we got to gamble with and gamble this year. But to do that the agency's got to get the contract with QuanTech this year to get the data to them at least monthly if not bi-monthly during that fishery. And then the agency can decide if we're in trouble we can cut it back. But I think that's something that -- I mean, being regulated out of a fishery, I know what it means economically to you -- charters won't come, he's got boat payments, got house payments, children, grandchildren whatever. And I think it's important that we look at it that way. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Jerry, Scott is a chief scientist.

Normally he has a call for papers, I believe,
abstracts do sometime in May, papers by July to get

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ready for the SCRS meeting.

SPEAKER: So it wouldn't be until the SCRS meeting?

SPEAKER: John.

SPEAKER: Any corrections that we want to make to our historical landings require a paper submitted to the SCRS. And I think actually the abstract might be July and the paper in August; I mean they're right before the SCRS. So there is time to do it.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Joe McBride?

MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, thank you, Chris. First of all I'd like to thank Rich, Glenn, John and the other people; the information you come up with tonight, I know you've been talking to Jimmy Donofrio through the RFA, and very important and thank you again on behalf of the membership of the MBCA, there's nobody else in the Long Island area. And again the --you have to understand the fisheries. And without going into great length, and Shana and I am sort of going to tell you, you know, to vitolet(phonetic) to what you said first. There are some areas where one fish a day such as we do with our shark fish, has more than enough for the clientele, and we maintain our business.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

For example, it's the business of a conversation group to be conservationists. It's a business of charter boat captains and head boat captains to be fishermen. If there were no issues to be involved with if you took aside other than what you're saying, you know, as a conservationist, you probably wouldn't have your job as a conservationist. If I would've told people in my business I'm going to take them out but there are no fish around, without at least warning him upfront, then we'll be out of business in very short order.

I'm making probably not a fair comparison. But I'm trying to give you an idea; 80 pound fish that they might catch, I don't know if they do or not, down in the Carolinas might suffice with one fish a day if we have a lot of action and so forth and so on, if the cost relative to where you have to go fishing. In our case we have to go far and we're catching 30-pound fish. That's not enough choice to maintain our clientele, that's number 1. Number 2, if we don't have a scheduled time to fish we can't book people. People don't walk in our docks and get on our boats the day of a fishery; we're booked months and months ahead. So in order to know -- and I've said this for many years, in order to know -- for my people to know

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and our captains to know when to book, we need a scheduled time for fisheries. And the same applies for Rhode Island that Frankie is representing to a great extent.

We need to have a scheduled time. Whether we fish there or not we have to book those fish whether the fish show up or not, whether they're big fish or little fish or in between fish. And more important that after we leave this meeting for the last five years or so, Jimmy has been kind enough to arrange a coastwide meeting with the National Marine Fisheries Service to distribute and with Rom(phonteic) and what have you, to see that all of the states up and down the coast get their fair share of the angling category, so everybody could maintain their business.

There were years in the past where we did our best to help North Carolina when they were just getting into that newfound fisheries, so to speak, and we worked as best we could, and we make a gentlemen's agreement, there's nobody writing anything down, and we think we have a fishery. And if we don't have a fishery under those circumstances, we should be notified as soon as possible so that we can make revisions and people don't lose money and their incomes. And, Pete, thank you, I'm serious, that was

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

very nice of you to say, but now my house is paid, I'm retired. I want to thank all you taxpayers that have been paying for years for me. But neither here nor there.

My grandchildren take good care of me like my kids did, you know, they're going to put oil on my wheel chair and roll me down the hill or something. But to make a long story short, it's just a matter of fairness. I mean I know you have limited resource, I know you have schedules and regulations to follow. And again I want to thank everybody here, I think we all do work together as a team, we're not perfect, we don't always have -- know what's down the line somewhere, but I think we should take cognizance of what's needed in our fisheries.

We work as a group, we all give up our time to come here and have a good United States fishery. But I do concur with the criticisms: Dick Stone was being very kind in his historical analysis of that eight percent story. It's a little nastier than what he said; he is too much of a gentleman. And I've mentioned in the past so I won't beat it to death anymore. Anyhow, thank you all for the assistance. Hopefully that -- the distribution will be a little more considerate of the areas that needed -- under the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

23

24

25

time span that they do need it under, whether it's north, south, or in between.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, thank you all. Let's call it an evening, and then when we get back tomorrow morning 8:00 a.m. sharp, we'll start off with Jimmy Donofrio and we'll be talking Bluefin again.

foregoing (Whereupon, the matter adjourned to be reconvened on March 23, 2005, at 8:00 a.m.)

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701